

THE
CHURCH REVIEW.

No. II.

JULY, 1848.

"KENRICK ON THE PRIMACY."

ART. I.—*The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated*, by FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK, Bishop of Philadelphia. pp. 488. 8vo. 1845.

IN the Churchman of February 12, 1848, we find the following advertisement: "Now in Press, and will be issued without delay, the Primacy of the Apostolic See. By Right Rev. T. (F.) P. KENRICK, D. D., Bishop of Philadelphia: a new edition, (the third,) revised and enlarged. In one vol. 8vo. The rapidity with which the first and second editions of this work have been exhausted, is the best proof of the interest generally felt by the religious world in the great question of the Primacy, and of the ability with which it has been treated by the Rt. Rev. Bishop of Philadelphia. This third edition will commend itself still more strongly to the favor of the public. Edward Dunigan, 151 Fulton St., Feb. 5, 1848, 3t 8."

We have copied this advertisement verbatim et literatim, because we think it very significant. A bookseller of the Roman Communion writes it and pays a dollar for three insertions of it in the Churchman. Men are not apt to pay their money for nothing. The bookseller's object was, no doubt, that the readers of the Churchman should buy his book; and as people do not like to buy, without having some worth of their money, all who buy, will probably read it. To avoid misconstruction, we must here observe, that we do not attrib-

ute, either to the Editor, or to the Proprietors of the Churchman, any agency whatever in this matter. It was, as we believe, a mere business concern between the printer and the bookseller. It is very probable, that neither the editor, nor the proprietors glanced their eyes over the advertisements; and if they did, and noticed this one, they may have thought that the readers of the Churchman were too well fortified against the errors of Rome, to be in any danger from it. Nevertheless we can not but lament that it was inserted; for Dr. Kenrick's work is specious and plausible, and there may be sincere and virtuous, but ignorant minds who, although they read the Churchman, may not be sufficiently fortified to be unharmed by the errors, or sufficiently learned and perspicacious to detect the perversions of the Roman prelate. These considerations have moved us to place the title of the first edition at the head of this article, and we shall now proceed to consider the subject to which it introduces us. His is an *a priori* argument; first attempting from the Scriptures to establish the primacy of St. Peter, and then, on the supposition that he was the Bishop of Rome, inferring that the Bishops of that See as his successors, have ever been entitled to the same primacy. We shall pursue a different course, by endeavoring to show our readers the facts of the case with regard to the Bishops of Rome, before we take any notice of the argument respecting St. Peter's pre-eminent authority.

I.

The naked fact that St. Peter was at Rome, and was crucified there in the first persecution under Nero, is too well established to admit of doubt; though in the scanty remains of the first three centuries, but little direct and unequivocal testimony is to be found. At the beginning of the second century, St. Ignatius, writing to the Romans to prepare them for his approach, says: "*I do not command you as did Peter and Paul. They were Apostles; I am a condemned man. They were free; I am even until now a slave.*" (Ad Rom. s. 4.) The inference is clear that *both* the Apostles Peter and Paul had *commanded* the Romans; but this may have been done without their actual presence. We do not therefore attach much importance to it under this head of proof, though we may have occasion to notice it respecting another point of our inquiry. Nor do we lay much stress upon the words attributed to Papias, a writer contemporary with Ignatius, that Babylon in 1 Pet. v. 13, means Rome, and consequently that the Apostle and St. Mark were at Rome when it was written. It is not certain, as Valesius and other critics of the Roman

Communion admit, that these were the words of Papias ; and if so, we have only the testimony of Eusebius, a writer of the fourth century.

The next witness is St. Irenæus, whose work on heresies has come down to us in an indifferent and barbarous Latin version. He affirms, that the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul founded and built up the Church at Rome ; but this they did, as he says, by committing "to Linus the ministry of the Episcopate." (*Lib. iii, cap. 3.*) Now this they may have done while they were in Jerusalem. It is true that he had just before said, (*Lib. iii, cap. 1.*) that "Matthew published among the Hebrews, in their own language, his written Gospel, *while* Peter and Paul were proclaiming the Gospel at Rome, and laying there the foundations of the Church." But Irenæus was merely speaking of the various labors of the Apostles and other disciples in various parts of the world after our Lord had risen, and the Holy Ghost descended, and not of the *date* of their *personal* presence. The Church of Rome was in being before either St. Peter or St. Paul went thither ; and if we attempt to prove too much by this passage, we must admit that St. Peter and St. Paul were at Rome at the very time when St. Mathew's Gospel was published, which is contrary to all the testimony we have on the subject.

But there was another Bishop, somewhat earlier in the second century, than St. Irenæus, of whose writings a few fragments have been preserved, and whose testimony is much to the point. We allude to Dionysius of Corinth, who, according to St. Jerome, flourished under M. Antoninus Verus, and L. Aurelius Commodus, or from A. D. 161 to A. D. 179. In his Epistle to the Church of Rome, occurred the following passage extracted by Eusebius : "In this your so great admonition, you have mingled together the planting both of the Romans and Corinthians effected by Peter and Paul. For both, when they planted us in our Corinth taught in like manner, and in like manner when they went teaching together into Italy, and suffered martyrdom about the same time." (*Dionys. apud Euseb. H. E. Lib. iv, cap. 23.*) Here is the important testimony to a fact of which there is no mention in the Acts, that St. Peter as well as St. Paul planted the Church at Corinth ; and thus it throws light upon another fact mentioned by St. Paul, 1 Cor. i, 12, that in the Corinthian Church, the spirit of party had led some of the converts to call themselves by the name of the person who had converted them : "I am of Paul ; and I of Apollos ; and I of Cephas" or Peter ; while others, rejecting all names of men, professed to be only "of

CHRIST." We learn also, that St. Peter and St. Paul went afterwards together into Italy, and there, about the same time, suffered martyrdom.

Tertullian in the order of time comes next. He is the oldest writer of the Latin Church whose works have been preserved; and he repeatedly mentions St. Peter and St. Paul together, always speaking of their martyrdom as occurring at the same time, and at Rome. A single passage is sufficient. "Nero first bathed in blood (cruentavit) the rising faith. Then is Peter girded by another when he is bound to the Cross. Then Paul obtains the nativity of the Roman city, when he is there new born by the nobility of his martyrdom." (*Cont. Gnost. c. 15.*)

Caius, a Roman Presbyter, who flourished early in the third century, (*cir. A. D. 210.*) speaks thus of the places where St. Peter and St. Paul were buried: "I have the monuments of the Apostles to show; for if you will go to the Vatican or on the Ostianway, you will find the monuments of those who founded the Church." (*Apud Euseb. H. E. Lib. ii, c. 25.*)

And lastly, Origen says: "Peter seems to have preached the Gospel to the Jews of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia and Asia. Finally being at Rome, he was crucified with his head downwards, for thus did he himself think it suitable to suffer. What should be said concerning Paul, but that having fully preached the Gospel of Christ from Jerusalem even unto Illyricum, he was finally martyred in Rome under Nero?" (*In Genes. Exc. Opera Ed. Bened. Tom. ii, p. 24.*) It is unnecessary to quote the writers of the fourth century, because they evidently depended, as we now depend, upon this earlier testimony: for the preservation of which, indeed, we are in a great measure indebted to them.

Yet, clear and positive as all this testimony is, that St. Peter and St. Paul were both at Rome, and that both suffered martyrdom during the first or Neronian persecution, not one of the authorities quoted mentions the precise year. For this we must have recourse to later writers; and their accounts are at variance. The persecution of the Christians by Nero, was occasioned by the conflagration which began, according to Tacitus, on the 19th, and ended on the 27th of July, in the consulship of Lecanius and Licinius. (*Annal. Lib. xv, c. 33 and 40.*) It was in the tenth year of Nero, which ended Oct. 13, A. D. 63. It is not likely that the persecution began before the eleventh of Nero, nor much if any before January, A. D. 64. The death of the two Apostles, is said by Sulpicius Se-

verus to have taken place in Rome in the same year in which the Jews began to rebel. (*Lib. ii, cap. 29.*) The latter event, Josephus tells us, took place in the twelfth year of Nero; and this accords exactly with Epiphanius, who says explicitly that the martyrdom was in the twelfth year of Nero. (*Hær. xxvii.*) Eusebius in his Chronicon, places the death of the Apostles and the revolt of the Jews in the same year, but in the thirteenth of Nero. Between these two dates, opinions are divided; but as it is agreed that the death of the Apostles and the revolt of the Jews were in the same year, we prefer the authority of Josephus, and so place the event in the twelfth year of Nero, and the consulship of Telesinus and Suetonius, or A. D. 65.

II.

The next question to be considered is, when did St. Peter first go to Rome? Lactantius, we believe, is the earliest writer who gives any definite information on this point. In his book *de mortibus Persecutorum*, Sect. 2, he says, that after the Consulship of the two Gemini, in which our Lord was crucified, the Apostles continued for *twenty-five* years to lay the foundations of the Church in the various provinces and cities of the Empire, *until the beginning of the reign of Nero*; usque ad principium Neroniani imperii. This account is very consistent; for there were exactly *twenty-five* Consulships, from that of the two Gemini, to that of Marcellus and Aviola, in which Nero became Emperor. Lactantius then proceeds: "*Cumque jam Nero imperaret, Petrus Romam advenit.*" These words do not imply that he came at the very beginning of Nero's reign, but when he had already reigned some time. The sentence must therefore be translated, "*During the reign of Nero, Peter came to Rome.*" But this is a very different account from that which is given by the modern writers of the Roman Communion. They contend that he first came to Rome in the reign of Claudius. We proceed then to examine on what authorities they build this assertion.

Eusebius, in his Chronicon, opposite to the third year of Caligula, has the following note: "Peter the Apostle, having first founded the Church of Antioch, sets out for the city of the Romans, and there preaches the Gospel, and dwells there as the president (*Præses*, says Mai, *Antistes*, say Aucher,) of that Church twenty years." In Aucher's edition, the number of years is thus expressed: *Annis Viginti, (quinque.)* That is, he *amends* the Armenian Version, from twenty to *twenty-five* years, to make it correspond with St. Jerome's translation, and the Latin writers of a still later period. The Greek frag-

ment placed below in Mai's edition instead of Peter the *Apostle*, reads Peter ὁ κορυφαῖος, the *Chief*; and instead of the last clause, says that "he presided first over the Church of Antioch, and then over that of Rome" "ἕως τελευτήσας αὐτοῦ," which means, "until his martyrdom." But these are the words, not of Eusebius, but of George *Syncellus*, a Chronographer of the eighth or ninth century; for the original Greek of Eusebius is lost. St. Jerome's translation is, "Petrus Apostolus—cum primum Antiochenam ecclesiam fundasset, Romam proficiscitur ubi Evangelium prædicans, xxv, annis ejusdem urbis Episcopus perseverat." He asserts the same thing in his catalogue of Ecclesiastical writers. All these variations show that the whole was the result of computation. Eusebius, according to the Armenian translation, which bears great marks of accuracy, placed the death of St. Peter and St. Paul in the thirteenth year of Nero, or A. D. 66; but in St. Jerome's translation, the same event is placed in the fourteenth, or A. D. 67. Nero himself was put to death in that year, on the ninth of June; and therefore, if there be any truth in the date of the Roman martyrology, that St. Peter suffered on the 29th of June, it could not have been later than A. D. 66. We have already given our reasons for believing that it was in A. D. 65, the twelfth of Nero. St. Jerome put the event as late as he could, because he allowed 25 years as the duration of St. Peter's Episcopate in Rome; and 25 years being deducted from 67, would place his arrival in Rome in A. D. 42. By shifting the date of the martyrdom to A. D. 66 or A. D. 65, the subtraction of 25 years would bring us to A. D. 41 or A. D. 40. But how does all this accord with St. Peter's having laid the foundation of the Church of Antioch in the third year of Caligula? That year began on the 17th of March A. D. 38, and ended on the 16th of March A. D. 39; so that if St. Peter arrived in Rome in A. D. 42, he could not have been more than three years at Antioch; and out of those years we must take the time of his preaching in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. Eusebius places Evodius as the successor of St. Peter at Antioch, in the second year of Claudius, which began on the 24th of January A. D. 41. That St. Peter could not have gone so early to Rome, is clear from the account given in Acts xii, of his imprisonment at Jerusalem, by Herod Agrippa. This event happened in the last year of Herod's life; and Josephus says that he reigned three years under Claudius. (*Antiq. Lib.* xix, cap. 8.)

But, excepting this computation, what other evidence is there, that St. Peter went to Rome in the reign of Claudius? The

account, it will be replied, which Eusebius gives (*Lib. ii. c. 14.*) of his victory over Simon Magus. But that victory itself seems to have been a pure invention. The story of Simon's arrival and conduct in Rome, is related by Justin Martyr, and Irenæus; but neither of them says one word about St. Peter. Justin relates that "one Simon a Samaritan, exhibited magic arts in Rome under Claudius Cæsar; that he was accounted to be a God; and that a statue was erected to him, having a Latin inscription, "*Simoni Deo Sancto.*" (*Apol. Pr.* or rather *Sec. Ed. Thirlby.* p. 38-40.) The stone with this inscription, was dug up in 1574, in the spot where Justin said it was, and was found to have been made, not for Simon, but for the Sabine Hercules Sanguis—*Semoni Sango Deo fidio sacrum.* The same story is told in substance by Irenæus, (*Lib. i. c. 20.*) It is curious to trace its progress downward and see how it improved by telling. By the time it got down to Arnobius, who lived early in the fourth Century, (cir. 306,) it had assumed the following shape: "They (the Romans) had seen the chariot of Simon Magus, drawn by four horses of fire, blown asunder by the mouth of Peter, and vanishing at the name of CHRIST." (*Arnob. adv. gentes. Lib. ii, Ed. Lug. Bat. 1651, p. 50.*) This is the earliest authority we can find for the presence of Peter. St. Cyril, of Jerusalem, who was nearly half a century later, says that the Emperor Claudius himself, erected the statue to Simon; that *Peter and Paul, who were both presiding over the Church at that time,* came together to oppose him; and that, while he was borne by a chariot of Demons in the air, the two servants of God, falling on their knees and offering prayers with one accord, cast him down to earth." (*S. Cyr. Hieros. Catech. vi, 14, 15. Ed. Bened. p. 96.*) All this, let it be remembered, was in the reign of Claudius Cæsar! The story, as far as St. Peter was concerned, accorded well with the computations of Eusebius; he could not doubt that if Simon and St. Peter were in Rome together, something extraordinary must have happened; and though silent as to all the circumstances of the prodigy, he improved a little upon the story, for the benefit of his computation, by making St. Peter come to Rome *on purpose* to obtain the victory over Simon. The sifting which has been given to such incredible tales, has led the best critics in the Roman Communion to admit that St. Peter did not visit Rome before the reign of Nero. The words of Lactantius imply, as we have already observed, that it was not even at the beginning of his reign, and consequently, even if he did reside there as Bishop, it could have been only for a few years.

III.

But the question now arises, whether he ever did sit there as Bishop of that See? And to that we proceed:

St. Irenæus is the oldest authority on the subject. He speaks in the passage before cited, of the Apostles Peter and Paul, as founding and building up the Church of Rome, by delivering into the hands of Linus the ministry of the Episcopate. He then adds: Anacletus succeeded him; and after him, in the third place from the Apostles, the Episcopate was allotted to Clement, who both saw the blessed Apostles, and *συμβεβληκώς* was intimate with them, &c. Tertullian (*de Præscr. Hæret.* c. 32) says, that Clement was ordained or consecrated by Peter himself; and the Liber Pontificalis acknowledges the same fact, and says that he held the See in the times of Galba and Vespasian from the Consulship of Trachalus and Italicus to Vespasian vii, and Titus, or from A. D. 67, to A. D. 75, nine years, two months and twelve days. We lay no stress upon these statements, excepting the admission that the consecration of Clement by St. Peter, must have been just before his own martyrdom. To account for this, consistently with the assumption that St. Peter himself was Bishop of Rome, the testimony of Irenæus, that Clement was the *third* Bishop from the Apostles is abandoned, and he is there represented as the *second*. We choose to follow in this respect the order of Irenæus, for reasons which we trust will be obvious to our readers. Eusebius has so followed him, in his account of the Roman succession; (*Lib. iii*, cap. 2 and 4 comp. with 13 and 15;) only that he places the commencement of the Episcopate of Linus *after* the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul, which was clearly a mistake. Indeed the whole account of Eusebius is full of inconsistencies, as we could easily show, and as Pagi himself acknowledges: "Neque enim in Chronologia Pontificia Eusebio magna fides habenda." (*In Annal. Baronii. Claudii Imp. 3.*)

If, then, Clement, the third Bishop after the Apostles Peter and Paul, was consecrated by Peter just before his martyrdom, which took place in the twelfth year of Nero, or June 29th A. D. 65, it is plain that Linus and his successor, by whatever name he is called, Anencletus, Anacletus, or Cletus, must have been Bishops of Rome before the year 65 of the common Christian Era, or within thirty-six years after the memorable day of Pentecost, from which the Church dates her origin. We have already remarked that we lay but little stress upon the early dates of the Liber Pontificalis, because we know not what dependence we can place upon its testimony. As it

comes to us, it is the work of Anastasius, a librarian of the Vatican in the eighth century. It is likely, however, that the records are of much older date; and if it were not for the intrepid assurance with which it utters the falsehood that Peter "ingressus est in urbem Romam, *Nerone Cæsare imperante*," and yet that "ibique sedit cathedram episcopatus *annos xxv, menses i, dies viii*," we might be more willing to admit the minute accuracy with which it assigns to Linus 12 years, 3 months, and 12 days, to Cletus 6 years, 2 months, and 7 days, and to Anacletus 12 years, 10 months, and 3 days. We can not admit the transposition, nor the splitting of one Bishop into two. St. Irenæus gives a list of twelve Bishops of Rome: 1 Linus, 2 Ἀνέκλητος, (latinized Anacletus), 3 Clemens, 4 Euaristus, 5 Alexander; and then he adds, "Xystus, (latinized Sixtus,) was constituted the *sixth* from the Apostles; 7 Telesphorus, who was martyred, 8 Hyginus, 9 Pius, 10 Anicetus, 11 Soter; and *now* in the twelfth place, Eleutherus has the lot of the Episcopate from the Apostles, in the same order and the same succession in which it is handed down from the Apostles in the Church, and the preaching of the truth has descended even to us." (*Iren. adv. Hær. Lib. iii, cap. 3.*) In the *Liber Pontificalis*, the order is as follows: 1 S. Petrus, 2 S. Linus, 3 S. Clemens, 4 S. Cletus, 5 S. Anacletus, 6 S. Evaristus, 7 S. Alexander, 8 S. Xystus, 9 S. Telesphorus, 10 S. Hyginus, 11 S. Anicetus, 12 S. Pius, 13 S. Soter, 14 S. Eleutherus. Taking away St. Peter, uniting the interpolated Cletus to Anacletus, and restoring him to his place as the second Bishop, instead of the fourth and fifth, the two catalogues agree; and that Irenæus is the more credible witness is evident, because of the age in which he wrote, the opportunity he had of knowing the truth, the absence of all motive to pervert it, and the marks of suspicion affecting the character of the opposing witness. Assuming, then, that Cletus and Anacletus were one and the same person, and that the duration of his episcopate was that of the two united, or 19 years and 10 days, we have, *from the Liber Pontificalis itself*, the testimony, that Linus and Anacletus held the Episcopate 31 years, 3 months, 22 days! For aught we know to the contrary, Anacletus may have suffered martyrdom before St. Peter. This would account for the consecration of St. Clemens, by that Apostle. Nearly 32 years, therefore, out of the 36, are accounted for. To get over the difficulty presented by these facts, and to save their darling notion, that St. Peter was 25 years Bishop of Rome, two catalogues, one in the National Library of Paris, transcribed by Pagi, the other in the Vatican,

prefixed to the *Liber Pontificalis*, give the names of Linus and Cletus before Clemens, but adds a note that "these two were *Chorepiscopi*, one after the other, in the times of the blessed Peter." *Risum teneatis amici?* CHOREPISCOPI! Country Bishops forsooth! How drowning men will catch at straws!

Both before and since, but more especially since, the labors of the learned Bishop Pearson, the more candid critics in the Roman communion have been obliged to confess that the early series of the Roman Pontiffs was in a state, if not of inextricable, at least of most troublesome confusion. It is a subject which they have not liked to touch. The perspicacity of Pearson has sufficiently shown how little dependence as to the early dates can be placed on the Ancient Catalogues; and that the succession of the Roman Bishops *must be deduced from St. Paul, no less than from St. Peter*; but he also was embarrassed by a difficulty which was not then overcome, and which affected all his computations, with regard to the conversion and subsequent history of St. Paul. That the crucifixion, resurrection and ascension of our SAVIOUR, and the descent of the HOLY GHOST on the day of Pentecost, took place in the Consulship of the two Gemini, was, as he knew full-well, the almost unanimous testimony of the ancients. But he, in common with the learned men of his time, supposed that their Consulship coincided with the year 29 of the common era; and they could not reconcile this with the Gospel history, because the computations of the Passover in that year did not accord, either with the Gospels, or with the month, and day of the month, as to which the testimony of the ancients was no less unanimous. Pearson died in 1686; and it was not until 1703, that Francis Bianchini gave to the world a reconciliation of the whole difficulty, by proving that the Consulship of Fufius Geminus and Rubellius Geminus should be connected with A. D. 28, in which the calculations of the Passover agreed with the ancient account of our LORD's passion. But Bianchini, though his proofs were strong, failed to convince, because he was himself embarrassed by another difficulty. The list of Consuls then received, was supposed to be correct; and the retrocession of one Consulship, seemed to throw the whole subsequent series into disorder. This difficulty was not removed until 1844, when it was shown by Dr. Jarvis that the last Consulship in the reign of Antoninus Pius, the year in which he for the fifth, and Marcus Aurelius for the third time, held that office, had been dropped; and that it was absolutely necessary to complete the acknowledged length

of his reign. For all this we must refer our readers to his work, and to the Vindication of it from the attacks of Prof. Kingsley in our last number. Suffice it to say, that the fact of our SAVIOUR's crucifixion in the Consulship of the two Gemini being now established, as we conceive, beyond reasonable doubt, and the early history of the Church thus harmonized with that of the empire, we are enabled to throw a light which has never yet been thrown, upon the incipient history of the Church of Rome.

The memorable day of Pentecost, on which the HOLY GHOST descended on the Apostles and primitive disciples at Jerusalem, fell upon the sixteenth of May, A. D. 28. Among the multitudes who were filled with amazement at the miraculous gift of tongues, were οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι, peregrinantes Romani, (or as it is in the Vulgate, *Advenæ Romani*, whence our translation renders the phrase "Strangers of Rome;") literally "the sojourning Romans." To show who these were, and what befel them, we must have recourse to Josephus, Suetonius, Tacitus, and Philo. Josephus (*Antiq.* xviii, 3, 5,) says that "Tiberius, on the complaint of Saturninus the husband of Fulvia, ordered the whole Jewish people to be driven from Rome; out of whom the Consuls selected 4000, and sent them as troops to Sardinia. The greater part of these, refusing to serve, on account of keeping the law of their nation, were punished. Thus for the wickedness of four men, the Jews were banished from the city." This is confirmed by Suetonius, (*Tiberius*, § 36,) who says that "Tiberius repressed foreign rites, both of the Egyptians and Jews, forcing all who adhered to their superstitions to burn the vestments and instruments of their religion. The Jewish youth he distributed in the most unhealthy provinces, under the military oath, and *the rest of the nation he removed from the city under pain, if disobedient, of perpetual slavery.*" Tacitus places this event in the Consulship of M. Silanus and L. Norbanus; and his account agrees in all its details with Suetonius. (*Ann. Lib.* ii, c. 85.) The four thousand drafted as soldiers, shows how numerous the Jews were at that time in Rome. Philo (in leg. ad Caium) tells us that "they inhabited the Transtiberine Region. The greater part of them had been brought as captives into Italy, liberated by those who brought them, and made Roman citizens. They were not forced to abandon their rites, but had their proseuchæ, or synagogues, where they assembled, chiefly in the holy weeks, and there made collections of their first fruits, which they sent to Jerusalem by those who carried the sacrifices. Philo adds, that after

the death of Sejanus, Tiberius discovered that the slanders, on account of which the Jews were driven from Rome, were "inventions of Sejanus, who wished to destroy the nation because he knew that the Jews were opposed to his wicked designs, and the acts by which he traitorously put in peril the life of the Emperor." (*Opera Ed. princ.* 1552, p. 698.) Sejanus was executed on the 18th of October, A. D. 30; and the Consulship of Silanus and Norbanus, in which the Jews were banished from Rome, coincided with A. D. 18. During that twelve years of banishment, no Jew could return to Rome without incurring the pain of perpetual slavery; and it was especially during the last six years of that period, that all the stirring events took place in the nation, beginning with the ministry of St. John the Baptist, and including, not only the ministry of our SAVIOUR from his baptism to his ascension, and the descent of the HOLY GHOST, but also all that is recorded in the first nine chapters of the Acts of the Apostles until after the conversion of St. Paul, that is, until the Churches in Judea, Galilee and Samaria, were no longer persecuted. We can now, therefore, be at no loss to perceive that the "strangers of Rome" who were present on the day of Pentecost, were the banished Roman citizens of the Jewish nation. We can not doubt that many of them were of the three thousand converted on that day by the preaching of St. Peter. But though converted and baptized into the Christian faith on the 16th of May, A. D. 28, they could not, for at least full three years afterwards, return to Rome. The death of Sejanus, as we have remarked, occurred in the last half of October, A. D. 30; and it is not likely that the examination of his papers and the full disclosure of his wicked machinations against the Jews, and of their entire innocence, could have been laid before the Emperor, till some time in the year following, or A. D. 31.

Let us now return to the history of St. Peter and St. Paul, the two Apostles to whom the unanimous voice of antiquity ascribes the foundation of the Roman Church. An apocryphal, though very ancient book, entitled the Preaching of Peter, is thus quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus: "Peter saith, that the LORD said to his Apostles, If any one of Israel will repent and believe in God through my name, his sins shall be forgiven him. *After twelve years*, go forth into the world; lest any one should say, We have not heard." (*Clem. Alex. Ed. Potter, Tom. 2, p. 762. Strom. Lib. vi, 637.*) The same is mentioned as an ancient tradition by Apollonius, who flourished in the last of the second, and beginning of the third century, under Commodus and Severus: "They say, that the

SAVIOUR commanded his Apostles not to depart from Jerusalem for twelve years." (*Ap. Euseb. H. E. Lib. v. c. 18.*) So St. Chrysostom argues, in his 69th Homily upon St. Matthew, that both before and after the cross, the disciples were commanded *first* to preach to the Jews in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and *then*, to the ends of the earth. "On this account," he adds, "the Apostles first preached to the Jews, *remaining a long time in Jerusalem*. Then, being rejected by them, they dispersed themselves among the Gentiles." (*Opera Ed. Montf. Tom. vii, 680—81.*) Whatever may be thought of the command, the *fact* is not unlikely; and both accord well with what is said, (Acts viii, 1,) that when the disciples were scattered abroad, (but *only*, be it observed, *throughout Judea and Samaria*.) on account of the persecution, the *Apostles remained firmly in Jerusalem*. The history of Cornelius also shows that St. Peter had confined his preaching to the Jews, until he was sent by express revelation to open the door of faith to the Gentiles, which may not have been until the time thus specified. Assuming, then, these twelve years as probable, St. Peter continued to make Jerusalem his abode and to confine his ministrations to the Jews in Judea, until A. D. 40, the last year of Caligula. Nay, we find him there at the passover, (Acts xii, 3,) April 10th to 16th, A. D. 43; and after his deliverance from prison, we read (v. 17) that "he *departed* and went into another place." This other place, which Baronius, and many who have followed him, *suppose* to be Rome, we, in the exercise of an equal right, *suppose* to have been Antioch. As there is only an incidental mention of him after this in the Acts, we turn to the history of St. Paul.

The events mentioned after the day of Pentecost until the death of Stephen, viz: the healing of the lame man at the beautiful gate of the Temple,—the imprisonment of the Apostles,—the death of Ananias and Sapphira,—the conversion of multitudes, and even of a great company of the Priests,—the frequent sessions of the Sanhedrim,—the bold and open preaching in the name of the crucified Jesus, both in the Temple and from house to house,—all passed in rapid succession. The enemies of the Church were roused even to the most infuriate madness; and it needed nothing but a general assemblage of the Jewish people, to bring on a frightful persecution. Such an occasion was presented at the Feast of Tabernacles, which began that year in the third week of September. Stephen was stoned; and the thirst for blood being excited, the young and zealous Saul began to make havoc of the Church. His miraculous conversion followed

towards the close of that year or the beginning of the next ; and then, after "certain days," in which he proclaimed CHRIST in the Synagogues, he retired into Arabia. (Gal. i, 13—17.) There he remained in strict concealment until the persecution had died away, enjoying those communications with our LORD CHRIST himself, which made him equal in all respects to "the very chiefest Apostles," and thus fitted him for the eminent station which he was destined to occupy.

At the end of three years St. Paul returned to Damascus, and thence went up to Jerusalem "to see Peter." There he "abode with him fifteen days, but saw none other of the Apostles save James the LORD's brother." (Gal. i, 18, 19.) It has been made a question, whether James the son of Alphæus, and James the LORD's brother, were one and the same person ; and on this depends the other question, whether he was one of the original twelve, or a thirteenth Apostle. Alphæus, if it was a patronymic and not the name of a fraternity, may have been another name for Joseph, the husband of our LORD's mother ; and the more general opinion is, that he was the eldest son of Joseph by a former marriage. But without dwelling on the question, what was the degree of his affinity to our LORD, it is certain that he was of the seed of David, and probably on that account, as well as for his eminent holiness, was made the first Bishop of Jerusalem. This office he held, according to Epiphanius, for twenty-four years after our LORD's ascension, and was then martyred by the Jews, in the ninety-sixth year of his age.

Making allowance for the "many days" (Acts ix, 23) spent at Damascus, and not including them in the "three years" after which St. Paul "went up to Jerusalem to see Peter," (Gal. i, 18,) he must have arrived there in the course of the year 32 ; and exactly at that juncture in which the Emperor Tiberius, convinced of the innocence of the Roman Jews, had released them from the effects of the calumnies of Sejanus, and restored them to the rights of Roman citizens. *Till that time no Church could have existed at Rome ;* and now, therefore, occurred, as we conceive, that important transaction, so often incidentally referred to by Epiphanius, in which St. Peter and St. Paul united with St. James, the Bishop of Jerusalem, in conferring the Episcopal succession. Hence *we date from this visit of St. Paul to St. Peter, the foundation in the metropolis of the Empire, of a regular Christian Church.* That St. Paul had the honor of it equally with St. Peter, we have the clear and consentient testimony of antiquity ; and that St. James, the Bishop of Jerusalem, had also a share in

it, must be inferred from the language of Epiphanius, himself an eastern Bishop of the fourth century, not very remote from Judea. His testimony, we have remarked, is incidental. It is, therefore, the stronger, because it cannot be suspected of design. He is speaking in his seventy eighth heresy, of the perpetual virginity of our LORD's mother; and in accounting for the fact that the Evangelists mention the brethren and sisters of our SAVIOUR, he says, that the first wife of Joseph was of the tribe of Judah, and that by her he had six children, four sons and two daughters. Of these, James, surnamed the Just, was the eldest. "*He first received the chair of the Episcopate, and to him first the LORD confided his throne upon earth.*" He is also called the LORD's brother; which accords with what the Apostle somewhere says: But other of the Apostles saw I none except James the LORD's brother, &c." Then, after accounting for his being so called, Epiphanius proceeds to say, that James was born when Joseph was about forty; that after him came Joses, Symeon, Judas or Jude, and the two daughters, Mary and Salome; that after the death of his mother, many years elapsed before Joseph, at the age of eighty, espoused the virgin; so that James was more than forty years old when our LORD was born; and that Joseph probably died soon after the twelfth year of JESUS, when he was taken up to Jerusalem, because, after that event, no further mention is made of Joseph, but only of the mother of JESUS and his brethren. All this, and much more, which it would be irrelevant to our present object to mention, is said by Epiphanius before he again speaks of the personal history of James. He then proceeds thus: "Only to this James was it permitted to enter once a year into the Holy of Holies, because he was a Nazarene and was mingled with the Priesthood." "James also added to the honor of the Priesthood; since the only two tribes which were interchangeably united in marriage, were the royal and sacerdotal." "This James also bore upon his head the petal;" (or plate of gold worn by the High Priest, with the words "Holiness to the Lord" inscribed upon it;) "and once when there was a great drought, he lifted up his hands to heaven, and prayed, and immediately the heaven gave forth rain. Henever wore a woollen garment; and his knees became as hard as camel's from his always bending them before the LORD, on account of his exceeding piety; whence he was never called by any other name than that of the Just (or righteous) one." After mentioning his austere life, his virginity, and his martyrdom, Epiphanius turns his discourse to

the blessed Virgin, guards against the worship of saints and martyrs, and though doubtful whether she died in peace or was martyred, cautions his readers against the Collyridians, who worshiped the Virgin, because he says Mary is not God, nor was she miraculously conceived. He then proceeds to consider the seventy-ninth heresy of the Collyridians; and after enumerating the twelve Apostles, including Matthias, as exercising the sacerdotal functions of the Gospel upon earth, he adds: "With Paul and Barnabas, and the rest who commenced the mysteries with James, the LORD's brother, and the first Bishop of Jerusalem; from which Bishop and the aforementioned Apostles were constituted the succession of Bishops and Presbyters in the house of God: ἐξ ὧν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῶν προειρημένων Ἀποστόλων, κατεστάθησαν διαδοχαὶ Ἐπισκόπων, καὶ Πρεσβυτέρων ἐν οἴκῳ Θεοῦ." He then proceeds to show that no woman was so constituted by them; that Anna and the daughters of Philip, though prophetesses, were not entrusted with the Priesthood; that there were Deaconesses indeed, but no Presbyteresses, for even Deacons in the ecclesiastical order were only the Ministers of those who celebrated the mysteries; and hence he concludes that it was neither proper for women to offer cakes as a sacrifice to the Virgin, nor for her to be worshiped as if she were God: καὶ μὴν ἅγιον ἦν τὸ σῶμα τῆς Μαρίας οὐ μὴν Θεός.

In the same incidental manner occurs his testimony with regard to the Roman Succession in particular. Thus, in the forty-first heresy, he says: "This Cerdo (or Cerdon) was born in the times of the Bishop Hyginus, who held the ninth lot of the succession from James, Peter and Paul, and the other Apostles: τοῦ ἑνα (Petavius reads, ἑνατον) τὸν κληρὸν ἄγοντος ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν περὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Πέτρον καὶ Παῦλον Ἀποστόλων διαδοχῆς." The very construction of the sentence, as all Greek scholars know, shows that Hyginus, in deriving his succession from James and Peter and Paul, derived it from *all the Apostles, as holding authority in coparceny from CHRIST*. In the forty-second heresy, Epiphanius says that Marcion came to Rome after the death of Hyginus the Bishop of Rome, *who was the ninth from the Apostles Peter and Paul*. By St. Irenæus, Hyginus is counted the *eighth* Bishop; but there is no discrepancy in the testimony; for he began with Linus, and Epiphanius with James, Peter and Paul.

We have now a solution of the whole difficulty with regard to the Roman succession; proceeding entirely from the adjustment of the true year of the crucifixion. All the authorities we have laid before our readers, have been long known;

and the facts they assert are incontrovertible. But so long as the date of our LORD's passion and resurrection were supposed to be unknown, the several facts could not be brought to shed light upon one another. The banishment of the Roman Jews could not appear to have any connection with the first foundation of the Roman Church, so long as it was supposed to have terminated before our LORD was crucified. But now it appears, that they were actually forbidden to return to Rome at the very time of the crucifixion, and that they could not have been allowed to return thither till the very year in which St. Paul went up to Jerusalem to see St. Peter, and when he saw only him and St. James, the LORD's brother, who was Bishop of Jerusalem. The presumption then is, and it is a most powerful presumption, because it reconciles and renders harmonious all the testimony of antiquity, that St. James, St. Peter and St. Paul did then and there consecrate Linus as the first Bishop of the Roman Christians. Thus the Christian exiles went back to Rome as a completely organized Church; and were *truly founded by St. Peter and St. Paul*, though neither of those Apostles had yet been there, any more than St. James, who never left his province of Jerusalem.

If half the testimony which the ancients give to St. James, had been given to St. Peter, we should have never heard the last of it. If St. Peter, and not St. James had been our LORD's brother, a scion of the royal stock of David, and related by blood to the family of Aaron; if it had been said of him, that "he first received the chair of the Episcopate," and that "to him first the LORD confided his throne upon earth;" if that throne had been established, not in Jerusalem, but in Rome, the imperial city; the glorious testimony of Epiphanius, would have been trumpeted to the world's end. But alas! it was St. JAMES and not St. Peter; and he is named *first* in the consecration of Linus, and spoke *last* in the Council of Jerusalem. "There was no pride in the Church," exclaims St. Chrysostom, "but great was its good order. Behold, after Peter, Paul speaks and no one interrupts him. James waits patiently and does not leap upon his feet; for he it was to whom the government was confided. John says nothing. The other Apostles speak nothing; but are silent, yet not moved with indignation; [alluding here to St. Matthew xx, 24.] Thus pure was their soul from vain glory. . . . 'After they had held their peace,' it is said, 'James answered saying—Simeon hath declared, &c.' Peter spake at the beginning more vehemently; James, more mildly. Thus it always

becomes him to do who is in great authority; to leave the more burdensome things to others, while he himself utters the language of moderation." (*St. J. Chrys. Op. ed. Montf. Tom. ix, p. 255.*) St. Chrysostom had just before observed (p. 253,) that St. James was *Bishop of the Church in Jerusalem, and THEREFORE spoke last.*

That council was held in the seventh year of Claudius, or A. D. 46, (Gal. ii, 1); and four years after, in the eleventh of Claudius, St. Paul arrived for the first time at Corinth, in the summer of A. D. 50. In that year the controversy concerning the Mosaic law had occasioned such tumults at Rome, that the Jewish Christians, equally with the unbelievers, were banished by the Emperor. Linus, of course, was banished with the rest, and was, therefore, sent upon some other mission. At the time of the council it had been agreed upon that St. Peter with St. James and St. John should confine their ministrations chiefly to the Jews; while St. Paul and St. Barnabas should go to the heathen. Accordingly St. Peter went to Antioch, and there, for a time, ate with the Gentiles; but when certain persons came from St. James of Jerusalem, who were zealous for the law, they induced St. Peter and St. Barnabas to separate from the Gentile Christians. This occasioned the public and severe rebuke of St. Peter, given by St. Paul, which, if he were Primate, he seems to have received with great meekness. (Gal. ii, 7—16.) After this time he appears to have traveled among the Jews of the dispersion in the upper coasts of Asia Minor. Many of these may have been the Jewish Christians of Rome, then in exile. "The strangers (*παρεπιδημοὺς διασποράς*) scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia", (1 Pet. i, 1,) were sojourning Jews. It is a cognate expression to the *ἐπιδημοῦντες* in Acts ii, 10, and properly means, as Schleusner well observes, not strangers, but foreigners dwelling for some time in a place.

St. Paul, in the meanwhile, having parted from Barnabas and taken Silas with him, and having passed through Syria and Cilicia, and thence into Lycaonia, Phrygia and Galatia, was restrained by the HOLY GHOST from going into Asia and Bithynia, probably because those provinces were then included in the mission of St. Peter, and perhaps of Linus. (Acts xv, 40,—xvi, 7.) He therefore went by divine direction into Macedonia, with Silas and Timotheus, and thence, leaving them at Berea, passed through Athens to Corinth. (Acts xvi, 9,—xviii, 1.) The Latin catalogues assert that Anencletus, the second Bishop of Rome, was a Gentile, and a native

of Athens. If so, he may have been one of St. Paul's earliest converts in that city, and may have been sent by him to Rome some years after. But as we know nothing of him except his name, we presume not to offer conjectures, which are mere inventions, disguised under the garb of history. We therefore proceed to glean from the Acts, compared with St. Paul's own writings, the dates of his Epistles to the Corinthians and Romans.

The Apostle must have left Corinth in the Spring of A. D. 52. He therefore merely touched at Ephesus, that he might keep the Passover at Jerusalem; that feast falling on the first of April, in that year. (Acts xviii, 1—23.) During this time Apollos came to Ephesus, where he was instructed by Aquila and Priscilla, and was finally sent to Corinth. (Acts xviii, 24—28.) While Apollos was at Corinth, St. Paul returned to Ephesus; and after preaching three months in the Synagogue, continued two years more to teach in the school of Tyrannus. (Acts xix, 1—20.) As we believe with Macknight, that he wrote his first Epistle to the Corinthians a little while before the riot of Demetrius, we place the date of that Epistle about the time of the Passover, or April 17, A. D. 56, in the third year of Nero. Let the reader now look back to the testimony of Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, and he will see that St. Peter must have been at Corinth after St. Paul left it and even after Apollos had been there; that is within the last three years before the Epistle was written, or from the first to the third year of Nero. Of this, as we have already observed, there is not the least mention in the Acts; but it must be inferred from St. Paul's incidental mention of him, 1 Cor. i, 12, and ix, 5. The testimony of Dionysius is conclusive as to the fact that St. Peter, as well as St. Paul, planted the Church at Corinth.

The riot of Demetrius caused St. Paul to leave Ephesus earlier than he had intended, or before Pentecost, (1 Cor. xvi, 8,) which fell that year in June. By his own account, he went into Macedonia, whence he wrote his second Epistle to prepare the Corinthians for his coming. He then went over all those parts, (Acts xx, 2,) that is Macedonia and Thrace, and even extended his preaching into Illyricum, (Rom. xv, 19,) before "he came into Greece." One purpose of his visit in Greece was to receive the collections made for the poor and suffering Christians in Judea, (2 Cor. ix, 3—5,) which, as he afterwards told the Romans, (Rom. xv, 25,) he was about to carry himself to Jerusalem. There can be no doubt then that he must have written the Epistle to the Romans from

Corinth during the winter of A. D. 56—57, in the third or fourth month of the fourth year of the Emperor Nero. From an expression of St. Paul in Acts xix, 21, we infer that a little before the riot of Demetrius, that is, early in A. D. 56, the Roman Jews had returned from their banishment; for he says that after visiting Macedonia and Achaia, and going with the amount of their offertory to Jerusalem, he "*must also see Rome.*" This neither he nor St. Peter could have done as long as his nation were in the banishment imposed by Claudius; and after the death of that Emperor, some time must have elapsed before they could return. But the Epistle to the Roman Church being written in the early part of the fourth year of Nero, and the faith of its members being then spoken of throughout the whole world, (Rom. i, 8,) we may conclude that their conduct during their exile, and their recent restoration, had thus made them the subject of general attention and remark. The very absence of all Apostolical authority must have made St. Paul the more anxious to go to Rome, that he might "impart unto" them "some spiritual gift, to the end" they might "be established." (Rom. i, 11.) Certain it is, that neither St. Peter, nor Linus, nor Anencletus, are mentioned in the salutations to the Roman Christians at the close of the Epistle. The inference seems almost necessary that they were not in Rome in the winter of A. D. 56—57; and hence the Apostle was the more solicitous to be in Rome himself. For the banishment of the Roman Jews had grown out of the contentions respecting the law of Moses, and the necessity of its observance by the Gentiles. The very object of the Epistle, then, was to settle the minds, both of the Jewish and Gentile members of the Roman Church, on this great subject, and prevent the recurrence of those feuds which had occasioned so great a calamity. Owing to the circumstances detailed in the last eight chapters of the Acts, St. Paul did not arrive in Rome earlier than May or June, A. D. 60. This may easily be computed. The arrest of St. Paul at Jerusalem, probably took place during the Feast of Tabernacles; for we think he could scarcely have arrived by Pentecost, which he intended to do, "if possible." (Acts xx, 16.) But whether he did or not, the various events recorded, and the two years spent in prison at Cæsarea, occupy the whole period till the winter of A. D. 59—60. His passage recorded in the twenty-seventh chapter of the Acts was in the winter, and he spent more than three months in Malta. At Rome he "dwelt two whole years in his own hired house" before his cause was tried, and he was acquitted by the Emperor; and

this brings us to the year 62, which, until October 14th, was the ninth year of Nero. During all this time not a word is said by St. Luke concerning St. Peter; and hence we are forced to infer that his arrival in Rome was after the period to which St. Luke limited his history.

St. Paul, then, and Timothy also, (Heb. xiii, 23,) were finally liberated in the ninth year of Nero; and from some part of Italy, where they both were, he wrote his Epistle to the Hebrews. After this, it is supposed that he accomplished the design which he had spoken of to the Romans of going into Spain; and having there planted the gospel, he visited Crete, where he constituted Titus the Bishop of the first See, and left to him the work of evangelizing the whole Island. His last visit to the Church of Corinth must have taken place at this time; and here he must have been joined by St. Peter, who, according to the testimony of Dionysius, accompanied him into Italy—both these eminent Apostles harmoniously preaching together the one Gospel of JESUS CHRIST.

In the tenth year of Nero, as we have already said, happened the conflagration of Rome, which led to the first general persecution of the Christians. St. Paul was therefore absent, and St. Peter had not yet arrived. Anenclerus, who may have been sent to Rome as the Bishop of that See *after* the Epistle to the Romans was written, A. D. 57, may also have been among the first victims of Nero's atrocity in the eleventh year of his reign, A. D. 64. The Liber Pontificalis makes the length of his Episcopate six years, two months, and seven days. We lay no stress upon these dates, for the Latin Catalogues are very discordant; but our readers must see that we are fully borne out even in our very conjectures.

On the arrival of St. Peter and St. Paul in Rome, both were apprehended and put in prison. During this confinement, and with the prospect of death before their eyes, the last memorials of their unshaken faith and love flowed from their pens. "I think it meet," says St. Peter in his second Epistle, "as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our LORD JESUS CHRIST hath showed me," (2 Pet. i, 13, 14.) "I am now ready to be offered," says St. Paul to Timothy, "and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith." (2 Tim. iv, 6, 7.) In the same Epistle, he sends the salutation of *Linus*, which shows that the latter was then living and at Rome; probably in the same prison, and ready to seal his testimony with his blood. After the crown of mar-

tyrdom bestowed on the first two Bishops of Rome, Clemens was raised to that dignity by St. Peter, doubtless with the approbation, if not the presence and assistance of St. Paul. The Catalogues are nearly unanimous in giving to his Episcopate nine years, two months, and ten or twelve days ; and this brings the Roman succession down from the Consulship of Fonteius Capito and Rufus to that of Vespasian VII, and Titus V, or from A. D. 66 to A. D. 75. The whole difficulty of the Roman succession has sprung from the disturbance occasioned by the attempt to make St. Peter resident at Rome as the Bishop of that See.

We observed, at the outset, that Dr. Kenrick's argument is wholly *a priori*. He assumes what we have attempted to disprove. If we are right, and that we leave for our readers to judge, his whole argument falls of course. Any one who will carefully examine his allegations and trace out his authorities, will see that he presumes upon the ignorance and prejudices of the persons for whom he writes. He has either taken his quotations at second hand, and is therefore superficial ; or he has suppressed the truth, and is therefore dishonest. We are content to leave him upon either horn of this dilemma ; but for the sake of our readers we will resume the subject in another number, in order to show that the Primacy of Rome was founded neither upon the Scriptures, nor upon the testimony of the Church down to the first half of the fifth century. The argument from the Scriptures is of much later growth. Like all other sects who depart from Catholic truth and order, they of the Papal Communion have ingeniously perverted the meaning of the Bible, and by forced interpretations have made it speak a language conformable to their wishes. Such has been especially their interpretation of "Thou art Peter," and "Feed my Sheep." Dr. Barrow has long ago exposed the futility of their inferences from these famous texts, by showing the sense in which they were understood by the Catholic Bishops and Presbyters, so late as the fourth and fifth centuries. Let our readers carefully study his immortal work on the Papal Supremacy, and then they may safely read the specious volume of Dr. Kenrick. For our clergy we would recommend a still more untrammelled and loftier method. We would entreat them to go back to the sources from which Barrow himself drew, the venerable writers of the ancient Church. Study them as he and the men of his age did, and they will see with their own eyes how to distinguish Catholic truth from Roman error.

S. F. J.

ART. II.—FORM AND SPIRIT.

It is the habit of some, to represent form and spirit in religion, as standing in rivalry and opposition. Yet, a little reflection will show that this is no just or philosophical view of their relations, to say nothing of its being a libel on the God of that nature, in which these instinctive yearnings are found. They must, as we shall see, be regarded rather as mutual aids and helpers, not as antagonists; co-operating kindly to promote piety and further the attainment of salvation, rather than warring against it,—securing by the reciprocal supports and succors of an amicable alliance, a far more valuable and excellent result than either could produce in a state of divorce and separation. Spirit naturally tends to develop and invest itself in form. In this it not only gives evidence of its existence, power, and quality, but also gains distinctness, animation, and vigor. Form thus reacts to refresh, strengthen, and cherish spirit; and in supplying it with a needful instrument of action and revelation, communicates to it fresh life, fervor, and efficiency. Spirit without form is not only ineffectual and abortive, but also feeble, languid and indefinite. Form without spirit, is a lifeless carcass, either mechanically moved by strings and pulleys into a set of irregular and unvarying motions, which it can repeat so often as the requisite force is applied, and do no more; or galvanized into spasms, bearing to life no nearer relation than that of a horrible and grotesque resemblance. Form enlivened by spirit,—spirit acting in form, is true life, healthful, energetic, perfect; revealing itself in natural, appropriate, useful action; actuated by a steady, intelligent, self-determining principle, that moves not capriciously nor monotonously, but with a wise reference and adaptation to the peculiarity of times and circumstances. By form, is meant all that is outward and visible in religion; by spirit, all that is inward and invisible. Together, they make the religious life. Separated, they are, the one, a miserable imitation, the other, a useless rudiment.

The union of CHRIST and the Church, is often set forth in Scripture under the figure of wedlock; as for instance in the 45th Psalm, where the idea is beautifully developed and elaborated. This sacred lyric exhibits the presentation of "the bride, the Lamb's wife," unto her royal spouse, who is "Prince of the Kings of the earth," and by reason of this superior dignity, "anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows." The whole Psalm is an epithalamium or nuptial ode, written

in honor of this august occasion. The king is the LORD JESUS CHRIST; the wife is the Church, to whom he is joined in an eternal covenant of affection and fidelity. It is the day of their espousals, and the bride is brought to the expecting and joyful bridegroom, to make and receive the pledges by which their union is to be solemnized. The representation is conformed to oriental usage. The figure is a favorite one of the sacred writers, and occurs frequently both in the Old and New Testaments. It is highly appropriate, expressive, and delightful. And it seems a significant and observable circumstance, that this alliance is more frequently compared to the nuptial occasion, than to the matrimonial state. It is almost always the bride and the bridegroom, just entering upon the close and endearing relations of wedlock, rather than the husband and wife, with whom they may have waxed trite and common-place, if not onerous and irksome. Is it fanciful to suppose that this is intended to represent the eternal freshness, the undying purity of the love of CHRIST and the Church? a love which never faints nor relaxes like earthly loves, but abides in an immortal *inception*, as it were, at least, in the continual liveliness and rapture of its first freedom and fulness. It is an everlasting *presentation*, an eternal *marrying*, a perpetual *espousal*. The song that hymns it, is a "new song" eternally; the wine that crowns the cup of its gladness, the bridegroom drinks with his immortal bride, "new in the Kingdom of God" forever and ever. The love that cements and gladdens it, finds naught to soil or dim it.

But the point in the description which applies to our present purpose, is the Psalmist's account of the bride's *apparel*. He says, "she shall be brought unto the King in raiment of needle work;" and in another place: "Her clothing is of wrought gold." So also, St. John, in the Revelation says: "The marriage of the Lamb is come, and the bride hath made herself ready." She is not, then, uncared for of her attire for the occasion. For her wedding day she has provided a wedding suit. She has herein obeyed a sound and laudable feeling. Her inward respect, affection, trust, and gladness, show themselves in her rich array. A coarse, every-day garb would not have coincided with her feelings,—would neither have properly expressed them, nor afforded them requisite support and refreshment. And, if her bridal feelings recommended to her, her bridal dress, no doubt, that dress tended to sustain and strengthen her bridal feelings. Something more than pride and ostentation, and far better, may suggest an unusual magnificence and carefulness at such a time,

whatever over-wise philosophers and sour ascetics may say to the contrary. A sense of the excellence of the occasion appears in it, and it reacts to foster the sense which it reveals. Nor would the bridegroom take it well of her, if she came to so interesting and important an occasion, in ordinary and negligent array. He might account it a doubtful token of love, respect, and pleasure, and a slender augury of constancy and happiness. Nay! not so did the bride approach. As "the King's daughter was all glorious within"—full of noble qualities, pure affections, and becoming sentiments, so "her clothing was of wrought gold,"—the fit emblem and expression of her inward excellence. She was brought to the king in raiment of needle work, in clothing elaborate, costly, and beautiful. The spirit showed itself in the form, and the form reacted to enliven and feed the spirit.

Our first proposition then, is, that *the Spirit of Religion tends to display itself in appropriate Form*. Every sentiment of man's heart strives for utterance; nor is speech by any means its sole vehicle of manifestation. The soul's different emotions, exercises and qualities, emblem themselves, and become visible in acts and guises suitable to them. This suitableness is a mystery, a thing to be felt, not analyzed and explained. It lies in the wonderful secret of our composite nature, hidden away in its depths, out of the reach of our coarse handling and rude attempts at scrutiny and dissection. Men are marvelously wise creatures, and yet live in the midst of millions of facts which they can neither understand nor explain. There is a wondrous system of correspondences between the outward and the inward, the visible and the unseen, the bodily and spiritual. What it is, or what is the ground of it, the plow-boy knows as well as the sage. So it is that by our constitution, we involuntarily think of certain inward and certain outward things as alike, and attribute to them resemblance. It will not do to philosophize about it, after the manner which the world calls philosophy. If we do, we shall quickly reason ourselves out of the instinct, and yet the instinct shall be just as lively and operative as before. It may seem, that matter and spirit, and the spheres in which they dwell and act, are so different in their nature, qualities and operations, that there can be no similitude whatever between them. Yet we *feel* there is; and that we—soul informed clay and clay-housed soul—are the link between them. As such, we not only combine their different attributes in ourselves, but associate properties of the one with properties of the other, feeling that somehow there is a correspondence of this to that, akin to

what we call resemblance between two material objects which our bodily senses pronounce alike ; that is, conformed to a common standard of comparison in some particular or particulars. Hence we call this correspondence, resemblance ; and we do not speak figuratively. There is something in our nature which pronounces it real ; and so it is, but we know not how. Now, this is the foundation of the expression of inward dispositions, emotions, and operations in outward acts, felt to be appropriate signs of them, to which men are spontaneously prone—of spirit in form. This constitutes suitableness in it, or that which not only leads us to assume certain guises or perform certain actions, in order to display certain inward states or exercises, but to feel that this guise or action is more proper for the manifestation of that thought or feeling than another. Hence the whole outward life of man is a sort of symbol or sacrament, in which the spirit within him is continually revealing itself, and to a discerning observer, disclosing its conditions and peculiarities. Hence we come at a knowledge of men by simply looking at them and watching them, as they, all unconsciously and involuntarily, are telling us stories of themselves, by living before us. The spirit, in which their real life resides, that is to say, their mind and character, shines through the gauze of their manners and ways, and reveals to men that have eyes and ears, things about itself which they, the while, perchance, supposed to be safe locked in the most secret chambers of their hearts. "A man may be known," says Ecclesiasticus, "by his look, and one that hath understanding by his countenance when thou meetest him. A man's attire and excessive laughter and gait, show what he is."

The spirit is the residence of a man's religion. "God is a spirit, and they who worship Him, must worship Him in spirit and in truth." Faith, gratitude, love, truth, justice, joy, peace, hope, are qualities of an invisible spirit dwelling in man, of which his bodily faculties have no cognizance. The direct sight thereof, is impossible by mortal organs. But the spirit is there, manifesting itself by its active and expansive qualities. It will not be content to remain dormant and hidden. It craves expression. Like the principle of life in nature, itself we see not, but we see its developments, and in them discover *it* and its powers and properties. It abides among us, and speaks to us, in the shapes which it fashions and produces. So the spirit of Life in religion clothes itself in a raiment of materiality, and thus becomes visible. There may be "form of godliness" without "the power," but there can be no evidence of the power

without the form. God recognizes this nature of religion, and sanctions it, adding to it his authority. Though he knows the heart, and could see the spirit in these, without any external manifestation, he authorizes and accepts none but an open, professed, visible religion. Its moral part is seen in practical virtues, in doings and refrainings; its relations to God and his CHRIST, are recognized by faith, and lives in devotion, in obedience to certain instituted ordinances, and a thousand spontaneous acts of which it prompts the performance. The Church of God, with its institutions and duties, is the great visible embodiment of religion in the world; and "every member of the same in his vocation and ministry," acting his part in it, and doing the duties it enjoins, develops, from the inner life, a visible body for itself, which witnesses to the existence and power of the life producing it. Nor is it a matter of indifference or of accident, how religion in the Church and its individual members, comes out to view, so that it by some means makes an expression of itself, and gains a palpable and noticeable lodgment among men.

So far as the Constitution and Ordinances of the Church are matter of divine appointment, they are of perpetual obligation; and neither It, nor any single man, has a right to vary from "the pattern showed in the mount." But that is not the point. We have seen that spirit develops itself in form,—craves expression; but does not equally admit of any form or expression. It asks a development correspondent to itself. It seeks to display itself in outward things, resembling inward dispositions; to weave for itself a transparency of dress and habiliment betokening its nature. God has recognized this tendency in his provisions for his exhibition of religion by man. The whole polity of the Church is a symbol. Its Hierarchy, its Unity, its Sacraments, are a fit expression of subjection, love, purity, flowing from the spirit, and living by faith in CHRIST, which constitute a living Christianity. And the good men, to whose judgment and taste the framing of details in our branch of the Church was confided, have done their work exquisitely well. Her enemies have been constrained to own her very firm and very beautiful, and praise her raiment of needle-work, while they endeavor to stigmatize her spirit as worldly, and her worship as lifeless and theatrical. The Church Catholic has never dealt in arbitrary appointments. Her ways and practices, the spontaneous outgoing of her inward feelings, are natural, tasteful, agreeable. In such a costume, the religious mind feels itself at ease and happy. Hence, the Church system keeps its hold upon man-

kind, and is permanent. The heart, ever the same, always loves the same things. The forms which it has once wrought for itself, through its own native impulses, it will ever delight to retain and employ. Neither its own law nor the law of its Head, enacts arbitrarily. Authority only sanctions that, which the Life that pervades it, craves and tends to produce. Hence its yoke is easy—a law of liberty. And hence its raiment of needle-work waxes not old, but like the spirit of man, of which it is the genuine out-going, is “the same yesterday and to-day and forever.” Not so with the ways and forms of schism. These are ever variable,—ever tending to dissolution and extinction. They are the offspring of opposition and self-will. Thus they are arbitrary, unnatural and irksome. The heart does not love them, because the heart did not create them. Here is the philosophy of a phenomenon that meets us on every side. The sects around us are abandoning their peculiarities to imitate the Church; and are thus falsifying the very grounds of protest and objection on which they left her, partly, to gratify their own inward sense of want and fitness, and partly, to accommodate themselves to the common feeling of mankind. Schism lacks symbolism, and therefore schism can not abide. It may stand for a time by the force of habit and historic associations; and it may prolong its life by borrowing; but what it thus gains, not spontaneously, and therefore, not uniformly and consistently developed,—in no true sense developed at all,—but only gathered in fragments, is a thing of shreds and patches without coherency or grace, and has no security of permanent continuance. “Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.” “Hereby know we the spirit of truth and the spirit of error.”

The whole Church system is wonderfully adapted to the spiritual wants of men; and a religious mind finds in it a perfectly natural, easy and pleasant expression of itself. That system is best, which, preserving the great features that God has impressed with his authority, is in its details the most perfect emblem and representation of the working and impulses of piety. It were easy to specify particulars. Nature dictates that we should kneel to pray and stand to praise, though if one were sometimes to come into our assemblies, he might either think us possessed of a very contrary nature, or not much addicted to prayer and praise. The latter is, alas! too clearly the truth. It is because the pulse of devotion is low that the attitudes of devotion are neglected. For there is a correspondence between outward postures and inward acts,

accompanying which the devout mind acting freely, not hampered by some contrary tradition, usage, or prejudice, feels and loves. We have here an almost boundless field on which we can not enter. Church architecture, music, rituals, garments, all have an importance in this view, which should not be overlooked. We ought to be thankful for so goodly a raiment as the Church possesses; for the opposite ways, into which some have fallen, very much in the spirit of contradiction as we deem, are less fit, less natural.

The question then is, not whether religion shall have a form, but what form it shall have. Some would have it all spirit. There can be no such thing. The Quaker set out to have it so, and became the most formal of creatures, only substituting a form artificial, unmeaning and ungainly, for one graceful, easy and expressive. Some would show their spirituality, by refusing to make a profession of religion and neglecting its ordinances. In most cases, alas! they have no religion to profess. If they have, it has its form in spite of them. All they do that implies it and declares it, is its dress, its visibility. But it is the form of pride and self-will, instead of the form of faith and obedience. To sum up all: Spirit requires form and produces it. The form it seeks and loves, is symbol, one which emblems and declares its inward nature and qualities. That form which is most declaratory and transparent, is most appropriate, beautiful and profitable.

Another proposition we maintain, is, that *Form reacts to foster and invigorate Spirit*. Much to illustrate this position has already been said. Not that form necessarily and invariably engenders piety. If it did, we should have nothing to do but to set ourselves to the constant and regular performance of rites in order to become religious—a recipe which would probably multiply the number of Christians considerably. Alas! no. There is much mere dead, husky formalism, in which no breath of life ever stirred, or ever will. A man who has no spirit of religion, may practice its forms forever, and never gain it. This is not the way in which, ordinarily, at least, it is to be acquired. But the spirit having begun to live, not only produces the form but grows in it. This we ought to believe if it were only out of deference to CHRIST's authority, who has appointed the Church and its Sacraments and Ordinances, as the ordinary means of grace and salvation,—Baptism, as the institution by which men put on CHRIST and drink into the spirit,—the Lord's Supper, in order to the strengthening and refreshing of our souls, by the body and blood of CHRIST,—her other services, as the regular and

efficacious means of developing and sustaining the spiritual life. There is indeed, a *natural* tendency to this gracious result. It is a general law of our nature, that manifestation and exercise are requisite to health and progress. Pent Life is feeble and languid. Life in liberty and action increases. Profession and worship, are the freedom, and light, and food of piety, without which it pines in feebleness and languor, and remains a meager and sickly rudiment. Let the spirit of religion go out naturally and unreservedly into its appropriate form, and it finds not only relief but aliment. It is nurtured and gains strength. It "increases with the increase of God." As every branch which the Life, in a living plant puts forth, is studded along its sides with the germs of new branches, so religion, in its formal development, if it be real, gains continually capacity and preparation for more extended efforts and advances. To "continue in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers," therefore, is not a vain thing, nor a matter of cold duty, nor even of mere satisfaction. It is the path of improvement, the way in which religion, having the vent and opportunity which it craves, may "go from strength to strength," and attain "the measure of the stature of the fullness of CHRIST." But that its action may be healthful and improving to the fullest extent, it is needful that the shapes in which it discloses itself, be indeed right and appropriate, suited to its nature, the spontaneous out-working and growth of its own native qualities. An artificial form, arbitrarily imposed upon it, for which it has no natural inclination and aptitude, cramps and debases it in the very act of disclosure; and what is worse, forces it to become, what it seems, to acquire the properties which it falsely professes, thus corrupting the Life which it displays and supports. Hence religion is largely caricatured, its native simplicity, excellence and grace being spoiled by human inventions and innovations, the awkward attempts of an earthly wisdom, to improve upon a divine model.

We have seen, that religion dresses itself naturally in symbolic garments, a raiment of emblems, integuments that exhibit a visible similitude of its inward qualities and operations. The Church of God, constituted and ordered upon this very principle, is, therefore, its native and proper home, in which it lives and thrives. And thus "the whole body having nourishment ministered and knit together," "according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love;" and "the whole building fitly framed together, groweth into an

holy temple in the LORD, in which ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the spirit." It is by no means the same thing, then, whether our religion be professed under one form of organization and worship, or under another. If there be error in the form, it will communicate itself to the substance, and so the divine Life contract foreign and spurious qualities, in attempts to live in shapes and fashions which neither the will of God sanctions, nor its own nature affects. Accordingly, we find real religion, out of the Church, visibly deficient in symmetry and completeness. If then, spirit tends to form, and to form of a certain description, so also form re-acts to sustain and invigorate spirit, and communicate to it health and strength, in proportion to its own perfection.

These topics deserve serious and habitual consideration. Form we must have,—form we must teach. But we must be careful and not mistake form alone, for the spirit which should live in it. We must be careful that we do not inculcate form, so as to engender formalism,—a dry, lifeless, mechanical religion, to the hurt of men's souls. And we may do this unconsciously, betrayed into it by a zeal against prevalent mistakes and the duty of bearing witness in favor of slighted and neglected truths. We shall do this, if we do not carefully preserve in our own minds the true relations of form and spirit. We can not too sedulously guard against the error, that form is the substitute for spirit, its certain evidence, or its unfailing generator. We may enforce it : for so does CHRIST, and the Gospel, and the Church. But let us enforce it, as first the out-going, and then the helper of that spiritual life, without which, it is neither profitable to man nor acceptable to God.

On the other hand, we may commend spirituality so as to engender enthusiasm, disorder and delusion. True spirituality is obedient, calm and constant. It neither seeks to hide itself in a barren invisibility, nor to come to light in willful, extravagant and fitful exhibitions. It quietly weaves for itself a garment fit to manifest its meaning and declare its inward excellence and beauty. Or rather, finding such a garment already prepared for it by the wisdom of God, and the concurrent judgment of the Church, it puts it on, and gains from it support, satisfaction and strength.

There are two practical mistakes, however, against which we should be guarded. Men are liable in the first place to underrate form, and so to neglect it altogether, or use it after a careless and slovenly fashion. "Such as are without," are apt to deem this a sign of spirituality ; and members of the

Church are too apt to imbibe the sentiment, or allow it an undue influence on their practice, either from an unconscious love of popularity, or a politic hope of conciliation. Take the case, then, of those who are living members of the Church of CHRIST, have been baptized into CHRIST, and are maintaining a life of sincere faith and true obedience. Such persons have the spirit, and the Church provides them with suitable forms, for its expression and nurture. If they would have this life continue and increase, let them use these means faithfully and perseveringly. Let them not account them beggarly elements, or think to become independent of them or superior to them. Duty and interest here coincide. Let them confess CHRIST before men, and walk in all his ordinances and commandments blameless. Let them not forsake the assembling of themselves together; and when they are in the house of God, let them engage devoutly in its worship and respect its order. Let them obey the Rubric; stand up to praise the LORD, kneel to call upon his name, lift up their voice as well as their hearts unto God in the heavens, and say "Amen at the giving of thanks," and utterance of requests in their behalf. Let them hear the Church; willingly obey her holy discipline, and abide in her unity. Let them partake of the pledges of salvation as often as she affords them an opportunity. Let them "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," "hold fast the form of sound words," and "maintain the profession of their faith without wavering." Such a course may sometimes bring upon them the stigma of bigotry and formality, but so acquired, it will be in truth a badge of honor and a token of the approval of God. In the persevering pursuit of this course, their profiting will appear to themselves and to all men. Their religion, we repeat, can never be happy and growing, unless it have expression,—will never sit easy and comfortably upon them, till it is wrought into a fitting dress,—will not improve and advance, till it is allowed to display itself in its own natural shape and attire. Christians on earth are human and bodily. They should not undertake to be angelic before their time; but be content with a regimen adapted to their nature.

But the members of the Church of CHRIST ought to be equally careful to guard against another and a worse extreme. Let them see to it, that in maintaining form, they do not rest in form. "The body without the spirit is dead." "Bodily exercise profiteth little." The most beautiful and elaborate dress is nothing to a corpse, affords it neither warmth nor satisfaction. Form is the expression of spirit; its ornament, not

a substitute for it, nor its producer. First of all, then, men, in order to render God an acceptable service, must partake of the life that is in CHRIST,—must “be renewed in the spirit of their minds,”—must feel themselves sinners, confess their sins to God and ask pardon for them,—must rely on the merits of the LORD JESUS CHRIST with a humble and lively faith,—must cherish love to God and charity toward all men, and live a life of obedience to the Son of God. Of such a spirit, form is at once the sign and the support. Having this to enliven it, let them put it on and live and grow in it.

PRIMATES OF ALL ENGLAND.

ART. III.—*The History of the Church of England to the Revolution in 1688.* By Rt. Rev. THOMAS VOWLER SHORT, D. D., Bishop of Sodor and Man, (now of St. Asaph.) First American, from the third English edition. 8vo. New York, Stanford & Swords, 1847. pp. 352.

It has been the lot of the ministry of Lord John Russell, when many supposed it near the end of its period of authority, to be called to select, within a few months, two Primates for the Sees of York and Canterbury. The elevation of Archbishops Musgrave and Sumner, naturally suggests a review of the line of their predecessors. Such a review we propose to furnish, for the period since the Reformation, and for the Primacy of all England; and, should it have for the reader the same interest as for the writer, it may be hereafter extended along the succession of the Archbishops of York. The work of Bishop Short, itself but a very summary abridgment, affords, however, a valuable aid for the more important portion of the chain.

Augustine and the royal convert, Ethelbert of Kent, founded the Cathedral of Canterbury, the mother of the Anglican Churches. Almost six hundred years after, its altar was sprinkled with the blood of Becket; and then, a statelier pile arose; and for three hundred and fifty years more, an army of pilgrims thronged to the shrine of the Archiepiscopal champion, who had conquered his king by his death. But the vast nave, the cloister, and the chapter-house, were of the age of the Edwards; and there lay the bones of the Black Prince. From the city and all the valley, the eye at every turn looked upward to the three towers and that circular wall towards the east, crowning the spot where sixty-eight Primates had already presided over the Church of England, through more than nine centuries. The city of Canterbury was the great thoroughfare for travelers between London and the Continent. The Diocese was nearly the same with the county of Kent, except the city and deanery of Rochester. In the palace, however, the Archbishops seldom held their residence; for on the southern side of the Thames, opposite to Westminster, the brick walls of Lambeth, to which Chichely added the Lollard's house, awaited them as they returned from the Court or Parliament; and a few miles north of the capital, they could withdraw to the more rural seat of Corydon.

The sixty-eighth Primate, William Warham, died in the summer of 1532, when Henry the Eighth was ready to lift against Rome the sword which Henry the Second had laid down at the grave of Becket. Abroad in Germany, Thomas Cranmer, Archdeacon of Taunton, was negotiating with the learned Lutherans the question of the divorce. He it was, a Cambridge Fellow from Nottinghamshire, who, retiring from a prevailing pestilence to the house of a friend at Waltham Cross, there met one night, at supper, the Secretary and the Almoner of the King, and suggested an appeal to the learned men and the Universities of christendom. When Henry heard it, he sent for the modest, candid, pious scholar, and bade him write, and dispatched him to Rome and to Germany; and now, passing all more renowned names, he summoned him home to the metropolitan chair. Well might he linger for several months, and wish to linger yet longer. Embracing already much of the doctrine of Luther, submitting in heart to the Word of God alone, and already even married in secret, could he attempt all which his conscience might command? Could he refrain from the attempt? Was he free to shrink from the miter, even if Henry might safely be encountered? How near, in any event, must his path pass by the stake or the scaffold?

Cranmer was consecrated in the end of March, 1533, reconciled to the oath of obedience to Rome as well as might be, by three solemn protests, which reserved his duty to God, to the King, and to the country. He was forty-three years old, a comely and pleasing person, though he had a defective vision. For twenty years he passed daily in and out at these gates of Lambeth, except when he visited Kent, and once or twice undertook, as Archbishop, a wider visitation. At Lambeth, he soon confirmed the marriage of Henry and Anne Boleyn; appealing, as the first ecclesiastic of the English Church, from the Pope to the next General Council. From Lambeth was he called continually to the chamber of the King, with a store of citations from the Fathers, which were readily minuted by his copious note books. Gladly he saw the whole monastic corruption go down; but gladly, too, would he have made his Cathedral and every other, a school of the prophets. Something of the pomp of his predecessors was missed, perhaps, by the world, for Cranmer wished to restrain the luxury of Episcopal palaces; but his bounty flowed far and wide; and when once a friendly statesman hinted at the sin of covetousness, he was frankly answered, that the Archbishop feared it much less than state beggary. For the first time, a

Primate of England sat down with his wife and little children ; but the sanguinary Act of the Six Articles, compelled him to send them away to their German kindred till happier times. His brother Edmund was his Archdeacon ; his brother-in-law was lieutenant of Dover Castle. In Kent, he had many enemies. Conspiracy after conspiracy followed him to the feet of Henry, and there broke ; for the simplicity and truth of his mind were not to be mistaken by the sagacious, hard-hearted monarch. Once, passing in his barge along the Thames, the King approached the palace stairs ; and when the Archbishop came down to salute him, he took him on board, and examined him, as if with the face of a lion, till Cranmer fell on his knees, desired a trial, and satisfied every question. Almost alone, he stood for a time among the Bishops, when Fox and Hilsey were dead, and Latimer had been compelled to resign his charge, and there remained only Goodricke and Barlow, who shared the sentiments of the Reformer. But, ever mild, ever unshaken, ever advancing, forgiving till seventy times seven, and most indulgent towards those who had offended most, he still held his way in safety, and obtained for England freedom to pray in the English tongue, and to read the English Bible. In the December of 1543, his Archbishoppal palace at Canterbury was consumed, and one of his brothers-in-law, with several other persons, perished in the flames.

From the deathbed of Henry, Cranmer returned to Lambeth, to frame a broader and a better Reformation. He was the godfather of Edward, as well as of Elizabeth, and was high in the council of regency. His wife and children returned ; he invited Bucer and Martyr from the distracted continent ; he proposed, digested and executed, with the able associates who now rose around him, the first and second Books of Common Prayer, the first Book of Homilies, and the original Articles. From the walls of Lambeth, the Scottish Earl of Cassilis, a prisoner there at large, after the fight of Solway, carried home the spark that soon blazed in every glen and nook of the North. Within those walls the unhappy maid of Kent, Joan Boucher, was in vain intreated to revoke the wild work, for which she had been doomed to the flames, while Edward signed the warrant with tears, and Cranmer, shocked by the accountability which the young King cast upon him, determined on one effort more to save her from her frenzy. Here, many a time, the good Prelate wept in the presence of his friends. But when he came forth amongst men, his brow was smooth and his eye was calm. At five in the

morning he arose ; the next five hours were given to reading and devotion, and the next three to business ; then followed dinner, and an hour at chess ; then, he went to his study till five ; then, after prayers, walked, supped, engaged in exercise or pastime, and at nine, retired again to his study. A placid life, in the midst of tempests ! A quietness, which was fruitful in mighty and glorious results !

When Edward had expired, praying with his last breath that the realm of England might be defended from Papistry, and Mary sat safe upon an undisputed throne, the man who had pronounced invalid the marriage of her mother, had little to hope from her clemency. Cranmer was shut up within his house, and though exhorted to escape, he remained firmly at Lambeth. Thither came Peter Martyr, fleeing from Oxford. Thornton, the Suffragan of Dover, had re-established the mass at Canterbury ; and Cranmer heard of the rumor that it had been with his own concurrence. At the suggestion of Martyr, he prepared a writing, in which he contradicted this tale, and which he would have affixed, under his hand and seal, to the doors of the London Churches. The paper found its way abroad, through the indiscretion of Bishop Scory ; and Cranmer was called to the Starchamber, and a few days after he was committed to the Tower. In the next spring he was sent with Latimer and Ridley, to dispute at Oxford ; and in the winter, Cardinal Pole, arriving in England, took up his abode at Lambeth, where the Bishops received his blessing. Not till February, 1556, was Cranmer degraded ; and on the twenty-first of the following March, disclaiming the recantations which had been wrung from him by fear, solitude, and the arts of his enemies, he held his hand forth to suffer first, and died, a blessed martyr. He could have no tomb ; but the Reformed Church of England is his monument.

On the next day, at the Franciscan Church at Greenwich, Reginald Pole was consecrated to the Archbishopric of Canterbury. He must have heard of the scene at Oxford ; and the image of his dying predecessor must have followed him to the altar. Although he was fifty-five years old, and had been a Cardinal about twenty years, and once had been all but chosen to the Papacy, yet so far was the simplicity of primitive order lost in the Roman Communion, that he had been ordained only in the preceding winter to the priesthood. He was the grandson of George, Duke of Clarence, the unfortunate brother of two kings ; and his father, Lord Montacute, was also the cousin of Henry the Seventh. His childhood and youth, from six years upward, were passed in cloisters

and colleges; at fourteen he had been ordained Deacon; and at seventeen went abroad to study, with the revenues of the Deanery of Exeter. From that age, all his life, except two years had been spent in France and Italy; at Paris, at Avignon, at Venice, at Padua, at Rome. Henry the Eighth had sought in vain the support of his learning and his eloquence. Safe in his Italian retreat, Pole prepared his work on Ecclesiastical Unity, overwhelmed his royal kinsman with invective, and urged an immediate invasion of his native soil. The bearded lion answered by deprivation and attainder; and when the intrigues of the Cardinal continued, he set a price on his head, compelled him to depart from Belgium, where he had been watching the affairs of England; and at length brought his brother and his venerable mother, the last of the Plantagenets, to the scaffold. Yet Pole was not only of mild temper and earnestly devout, but also at the Council of Trent, even strove, with some of his Italian friends, to obtain a decision in favor of justification by faith; and his house at Viterbo was said to be a sanctuary for Lutherans. Queen Mary had been brought up under the charge of his mother, and loved him with such affection, that at one time it was believed she would ask a dispensation for their marriage. As soon as she ascended the throne, he was appointed legate to England; but the policy of Gardiner obliged him to remain on the continent till the union of Mary to King Philip. Bishop Thirlby hastened to meet him at Dover; and after he had invited the Parliament to a reconciliation to the common faction of Christendom, he publicly absolved the whole realm on St. Andrew's Day, 1554; and from that time remained at Lambeth, a Primate without consecration. Ill health, long absence from his country, the calamities of his house, the delays and embarrassments thrown in the path of his legatine authority, had embittered his heart. He saw a people that unwillingly bowed itself to a control, which he meant to exercise in the spirit of his motto, "be ye wise as serpents, and harmless as doves." He shrunk from the society and the measures of the harsh men who were kindling the flames, even within his Diocese. Harpsfield, his Archdeacon, and Thornton, brought twenty-four persons to the stake in the year 1557; and in November, 1558, three men, a woman, and a young maiden, were burned together at Canterbury.

The Cardinal Archbishop, in the mean time, conversed little except with his dear friends, Ormaneto and Prioli, who had accompanied him from Italy. Sometimes, too, the wise Cecil, who had brought his conscience to a passive conformity,

might be seen in his society. The rhetoric of Pole, always florid, had become pompous and uninteresting; and he could have little delight in calm studies, while the imperious Pope, Paul the Third, was seeking his destruction, and while he saw the sway of Rome in England trembling with the lip of a feeble princess, and upheld only by perpetual horrors. His legatine powers were recalled, in the midst of his wisest plans, and given to Peyto, a Franciscan friar, and with them would have passed the honors and influence of the Primacy. But the spirit of King Henry awoke for a moment in his daughter, and she forbade Peyto to set foot in England. Pole, however, laid down the ensigns of his legatine authority, and partially opposed the hot pontiff; who remembered but too well that at his own election, Pole had been the candidate of Queen Mary.

Thus, for four years, the illustrious, and learned, and exemplary ecclesiastic, than whom Rome could have found in Christendom no nobler champion, sat mournfully in Lambeth Palace. There was a sad parallelism between his life and that of his devout, bigoted and misguided sovereign. Both had suffered wrongs in the persons of their parents; both had steadfastly resisted the wrath of Henry; both had fallen into melancholy; and they were now declining towards the grave together. The Cardinal had long struggled with a double quartan ague, and was sinking rapidly. A few days before the death of the Queen, he sent a letter and a message by his chaplain to the Princess Elizabeth. On a November day, a week after the last executions at Canterbury, the citizens of London, with unrestrained joy, announced to one another that a new sovereign had succeeded to the throne of Mary. Within sixteen hours after, the Archbishop breathed his last, and Lambeth was in mourning. His body lay there in state for forty days, and then was buried at Canterbury; and orations were spoken by Pates and Goldwell, the Bishops of Worcester and St. Asaph, his old companions in exile. His whole estate passed by his will to his friend Prioli; and Prioli gave it away, reserving only his diary and breviary. He had been Chancellor of Oxford, and had prepared a body of statutes for the University; and he built a large portion of Lambeth Palace.

Amongst the many who came up to London in the stirring days which followed the accession of Queen Elizabeth, her eye was arrested by the chaplain of her mother; the man to whom Anne Boleyn, before she died, had affectionately commended her royal daughter. Matthew Parker came up,

with thirty pounds in his purse, and suffering with a rupture, the effect of one of his escapes by night, when the emissaries of persecution were abroad in his native Norfolk. Now he fell from his horse, and never afterwards was completely relieved from the injury. Although he had been Dean of Lincoln under King Edward, and Master of his College at Cambridge, he now desired no more than a prebend, and an opportunity to lift his voice, which was feeble, in small parishes. But Elizabeth had marked him for the seat of Cranmer; and he pleaded his infirmities in vain. On the seventeenth of December, 1559, he was consecrated in the Chapel at Lambeth, by Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgskin, the remnant of the Reformed Episcopacy; but for sometime before, he had occupied the palace, which for sixteen years was to be his abode.

Parker was then of the same age at which Pole had received consecration. But in all things beside, unless in a kindred moderation of temper, slight indeed was the resemblance. With a calm, open, bold countenance, he appeared wherever the offices of his high ministry demanded his presence, and performed each with a characteristic love of order. With the same precision, he gave himself to the manifold arrangements of the second Reformation, indisposed to any excise, free from the impressions which a foreign exile had formed in the minds of many of his brethren, and desiring no more than a sober uniformity and obedience. Elizabeth placed him at the head of commissions, whose strictness her ministers would not permit her to sustain; and many were the weary hours of Parker, when he saw that he must bear the odium of a rigor which had been urged upon him by the very authorities by whom he was now forsaken. Once, the ministers of London and Southwark were all cited to appear at Lambeth, and required to promise conformity on pain of immediate suspension; and thirty of them went away, suspended from their ministry. At another time, the Primate visited the Diocese of Winchester, and suspended a company of Clergymen for their refusal to wear the habits; and on his return, was coldly received by the Queen, who speedily restored them. It was a painful mortification, too, for the good Archbishop, when, in his latter days, he was betrayed by a false steward into the belief, that more of the nonconformists had conspired against his life and that of the Lord Treasurer Burleigh. Three divines of character were arrested; but the council pronounced the documents to be forgeries, and Parker, much blamed for his haste, returned to his palace to die.

There, he had loved to mingle his antiquarian studies with his divinity. He delighted in the Anglo-Saxon relics, and published the *Homily* of Aelfric; he founded the society of Antiquaries; he versified the Psalms, in quaint, rough numbers. Margaret Harlestone, to whom, through the seven years when the Act of the Six Articles made the marriage of Clergymen a felony, he had been contracted, now shared his eminence with worthy hospitality. "Mistress," said Queen Elizabeth, whose prejudices are well known, "Mistress I will not call you, and Madam I must not call you, but however, I thank you for your entertainment." She died six years before him, and he was bereaved, also, of his second son, who had married the daughter of Bishop Barlow. He caused the lives of his predecessors to be prepared by Josseline, and collected many manuscripts, which he gave to his College. The organ in Canterbury Cathedral; the extensive repairs of the chancels and palace—the grammar school at Rochdale; the completed palace and chancel at Bekesbourn; the Regent Walk at Cambridge; the long bridge into the Thames at Lambeth, told his munificence; and many were the ancient monuments, which owed to him their careful preservation. His own tomb and tombstone were made at Lambeth, of plain workmanship, while he lived; on his seal, a representation of the last judgment was engraved; and his favorite motto was, in Latin, "the world passeth away, and the lust thereof." Dying daily in spirit, and worn down by a severe disease, he wrote a few days before his end, to Lord Burleigh, "trusting," he said, "that it should be one of his last letters." Under the Commonwealth, his bones were disinterred, but after the Restoration were replaced, with the words, "*hic requiescit tandem*," "here rests *at last*."

The friendship and policy of Burleigh, called the mild Grindal from York to the Primacy of all England. In the mind of the maiden queen, he was befriended by his celibacy. It was his habit in the administration of his revenues, to receive contentedly what was paid, to give willingly what was asked, and to expend much in the repairs of his houses; and so easy was his temper, that within six months after his translation, he granted to his kinsmen and friends sixscore leases and patents. The Earl of Leicester, the royal Primate, had the assurance to propose that he should alienate to him the very palace of Lambeth. But Grindal could be firm, even to martyrdom, when in his conscience he judged that there was a cause. He not only refused the request of Leicester, but exasperated him yet more by condemning the unlawful mar-

riage of his Italian physician. Almost at the threshold of his Primacy, he encountered, and endured to the end, a far more searching trial. He was charged by his jealous sovereign to issue injunctions for the suppression of the "prophesyings," or meetings of ministers for common edification, to reduce the number of preachers among the clergy, and to cause Homilies to be read instead of sermons. He answered like the companion of Ridley, that he could not with a safe conscience give his assent to these measures, and he wrote to the Queen in language of apostolic warning. Persuaded, entreated, menaced, he abode by this resolve; and was confined to his house by order of the Court of Starchamber, and sequestered for six months from his jurisdiction. At the end of that period, he wrote, at the suggestion of Burleigh, a very humble letter to the Council; but as he could not acknowledge a fault in the honest fulfillment of his spiritual office, he remained still under a partial restraint, and never regained the power of Elizabeth. The Bishop interceded; the lower House of Convocation pleaded, and some would have refused to act without their head; all was fruitless, and during the seven years of his Primacy, he lived in retirement, with a good conscience and his books, and with little influence on the government of his province. Gradually his books failed him with his eyesight; he became almost wholly blind, and Elizabeth offered him a pension, if he chose to resign, intending to bestow his see on Bishop Whitgift. In the presence of the Queen, however, Whitgift refused to succeed Grindal while he lived; and she replied, "Well, an Archbishop I made him, and an Archbishop he shall die." Comforted by his habitual motto, "A strong tower is the name of the Lord," he passed his closing days at Croydon; and by his will, bequeathed the whole of his small estate to pious uses. The free grammar school at St. Bees, near his birthplace, was built and endowed by his benefactions; and Pembroke Hall and Magdalene College at Cambridge, and Queen's College at Oxford, had felt his bounty. He died at sixty-four; and though he was remembered by all good men with veneration, as he had been a lover of all good, yet when he slept in peace at Croydon, under his splendid tomb, many a poor pastor might say with Spencer, who disguises his name under an anagram.

"But I am taught by Algrind's ill
To love the low degree."

The death of Grindal was in July, and Whitgift succeeded him in September. It seemed that the old days of metropoli-

tan pomp had returned. Once in three years the Archbishop went down into Kent, and as he rode into Canterbury, he was followed by a train of two hundred retainers, and six or eight hundred horsemen beside. Yet, only once in twenty-one years did he subject the clergy of his Diocese to the common charges of a visitation. At Lambeth or at Croyden, he gave audience to suitors twice a day; and sometimes, on occasions of state, he was served on bended knee. Elizabeth loved a character not wholly unlike her own in its union of moderation with firmness, of a complacent answer with determined perseverance, and of economy with magnificence. She visited him often; called him, with her rather coarse playfulness, her "little black husband;" called his servants her servants; saluted him at parting; sought his assistance for her private devotions; committed all ecclesiastical affairs to his hands, saying that, if anything went amiss, it must be upon his soul and conscience; was supposed to make him her confessor; and would not eat flesh in Lent without his license. On his side, Whitgift feared not to speak in her presence of the sins of her father, and of the danger of depriving the Church of property which had been dedicated to sacred uses; and on the day after the Queen had dined with him at Croydon, he would go and dine with the inmates of the hospital which he had built and endowed, and call them his brothers and sisters. It was his custom to repair daily to the Council; and if no ecclesiastical business demanded his attention there, he presently withdrew. He might even have been Lord Chancellor, had he not preferred to obtain the dignity for his friend Sir Christopher Hatton.

Vigorous, and yet scarcely harsh, was the sway with which Whitgift repressed the rising nonconformists. The year 1584, the first of his Primacy, was called "the woful year of subscription." Remonstrances and complaints came in; some of the clergy of his own Diocese appealed to the Council. Burleigh, Walsingham, Leicester, advised indulgence, and the great Lord Treasurer ever addressed the Primate with a dignified severity; but Whitgift, never failing in respect, yet never yielding a foot of ground, boldly called on the Council to sustain him against young and hot despisers of authority. When ecclesiastical measures were introduced into Parliament, he fled to the Queen, who took care that they should be reserved for the Convocation or herself. Like a high priest, like Jehoiada, with whom he was compared in his funeral sermon, Whitgift ruled the Church; and it was in his heart to build high the walls of Zion. He superseded the

"prophesyings," by instituting exercises under the Archdeacons; he saw the learning of the clergy much improved and improving; he secured a great uniformity, without superfluous severity, for he always inclined to the gentler sentence; and laboring under his motto, "he conquers who endures," he overcame every obstacle, and governed with success.

It was at Lambeth, in 1595, that Whitgift assembled several learned prelates and divines, to consider the hostility which had begun to disclose itself against the predestinarian doctrines of Augustin and Calvin. Strong and stern were the words of their judgment, in "the Lambeth Articles," which had never an authority beyond the names of their authors, but which remained to assure posterity of the character of the Church under Elizabeth. The Archbishop, in his latter years, said often that two things helped much to make a man confident in a good cause; old age and childlessness. He saw, admired, warned and resisted the strange causes of young Essex; and being at court on the day of his attempted rebellion, hastened across the Thames, and despatched sixty of his servants, who were the first that came to his rescue. When Elizabeth died, he bade her fix her last thoughts on God; witnessed her last wishes for the succession; sent by Nevil, the Dean of his Cathedral, the submission of the English clergy, to King James; and was chief mourner at the funeral of his royal mistress. Perhaps his age betrayed itself in his repeated thanksgivings at the Hampton-Court Conference, for the gift of such a King, who, he said, spoke surely by inspiration. Afflicted with jaundice, he foresaw with the anxiety of threescore and ten, the Parliament of 1604, and desired that he might not live to see its opening, which was to be on the tenth of March. In the days immediately preceding it, he went in a barge to consult the Bishop at Fulham, and took a cold; and, while he was going to the council-chamber to dinner, was smitten in his right side with palsy. The King hastened to his bedside; but he could only say, "*pro ecclesia Dei*," with an indistinct utterance; and expired on the twenty-ninth of February. His tomb is at Croydon, with the hospital and school which he founded.

Bishop Bancroft, of London, had succeeded to the influence of Whitgift, and now succeeded to his office. He sat at Canterbury but six years; but these were years of labor and active conflict. The Canons of 1604, and those of 1607, were passed under his recommendation; the former with the royal sanction; the latter, disallowed as penetrating too far into the mysteries of the theory of civil government. A persevering

contest against the interposition of the courts of law between the ecclesiastical tribunals and the clergy, ended in the defeat of the Primate. The new version of the Holy Scriptures was prosecuted and completed, with his revision. Stirred to its depths by the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot, the feeling of England demanded that strict enforcement of the laws against Romish recusants, which the temper of Bancroft inclined him to execute. With equal strictness he attempted the suppression of Puritan encroachments by legal power, and failed in the attempt. The arm of prerogative was too short; and it was unhappy that, at a time when the spirit of English liberty was springing up to a career of youthful vigor, the Church should have been subjected to the prejudice of linking its interests with the cause of arbitrary sovereignty. Prompt, decided, moderate in his requisitions, but inflexible in exacting obedience, Bancroft might not surround himself with ardent friends, but if he had enemies, his directness and sincerity compelled their respect. The learned and eccentric Hugh Broughton, indeed, attacked him by publishing "a petition to the Lords, to examine the religion and carriage of Archbishop Bancroft," and sent him a copy by the hands of a gentleman. With his accustomed union of apathy towards opposition, and energy in his own purposes, the Primate received the messenger kindly, but despatched his officers at once to seize every other copy. At another time, a gentleman visiting him, found a libel posted on his door, and took it down; and the Archbishop bade him cast it to a heap of a hundred more within.

The tastes of Bancroft were simple; and the magnificence of his predecessors was exchanged for a more frugal hospitality. There were those whose sense of dignity was offended, because a tradesman was his steward. In times when a prelate could hardly avoid offense, he was most unjustly charged with parsimony; for he left but six thousand pounds behind him, and all his revenues were wisely and charitably employed. As Chancellor of Oxford, he also published a body of statutes; and was Puritan enough to forbid long hair amongst the members of the University. The last event of note under his Primacy, was the consecration of the Scottish Bishops. In opposition to Andrews, he maintained that it was not needful to ordain them again as presbyters, after their first ordination by presbyters; adding that, if it were, it might be doubted whether there were any lawful vocation in most of the Reformed Churches. Andrews was satisfied, and the consecration was performed, but not by the hands of Bancroft.

He suffered, like so many divines and scholars of that age, from the stone ; and a week after this consecration, perceiving his danger, he prepared his last testament. It is melancholy to see how distinctly the clouds of a tempest which was then at a distance, rose on his dying contemplation. He had by a former will, bequeathed gifts to the Church, which the apprehension of change now led him to recall ; and when now he left his library to his successors, he added a provision which, at the death of the second of their number, was fulfilled ; that, should the Archbishopric fail, the library should pass to the Chelsea College, and, if that took not effect, to the University of Cambridge. It was his injunction that his body should not be opened, but buried with little expense, and without other monument than a plain stone ; and that Bishop Abbot, or Bishop Harsnet, or some one of his Chaplains, should preach his funeral sermon. He died early in November, 1610, and was buried in the Church of Lambeth. An honest and earnest, a bold and unselfish man, sleeps there.

It is said that Andrews was recommended by the other Bishops for the vacant chair at their head ; but with King James the tide of favor was very strong while it endured, and it ran long enough with Bishop Abbot to waft him, in little more than a year, from a Deanery, through two important Bishoprics, to the See of Canterbury. There he presided twenty-three years, a longer period than any other Primacy since the Reformation. The hospitality that became his palace was freely and nobly dispensed ; and the metropolitan dignity was in his time beheld with universal reverence. He indeed was not affable in his intercourse, and, it was his misfortune, gifted as he was with a capacious understanding, which had been exercised in public affairs, and having never held a parochial charge, to be much involved in business, and less able to sympathize with the Clergy. But he found time for his work on Jonah ; his zeal was manifest, and his life was blameless : and the popularity which his manners might not have won, was awarded to the boldness and candor with which he upheld the doctrine of the Reformation, and the liberties of England. His policy towards the Puritans was mercy ; he would spare the conscience of weak brethren, if they would refrain from reviling the Church ; he was on the moderate side in all ritual questions ; and yet he was firm in the courts of High Commission and the Star Chamber, and was more blamed for resisting than following the current of the times.

In the sickness of the young Prince Henry, Abbot was with him ; he apprised him of his danger, and preached his funeral

sermon. He spoke the Protestant feeling of the English people, when he gave his blessing to the union of the Princess Elizabeth with the Elector Palatine, and also when he afterwards counselled the King to arm in defense of their claim to the crown of Bohemia, declaring his preference that the money for the war should be raised "in the old and honorable way of trusting God and the Parliament." With Bishop King, he opposed the divorce of the Countess of Essex, and published stories to which James himself replied. Not less boldly, he said that if the scheme of a toleration for the Papists were executed, the King could no longer be deemed the defender of the Faith. But, while the Primate maintained the Calvinistic doctrine, and seemed ever to doubt the claim of the Roman communion to a place within the visible Church, and scarcely molested nonconformists, an able and active party was forming itself around him, which smiled on the opinions of Arminius, approached towards the Romish love of ceremonies, and admitted no compromise with Puritanism. At its head were Harsnet and Neile; and behind them a zealous array of younger ecclesiastics. Abbot, in the mean while, had all which worldly ambition could crave, and bore it meekly. He was still at the head of the Church; his elder brother Robert, in 1615, became Bishop of Salisbury; his younger brother, Sir Maurice, was Lord Mayor of London; and when Villiers, afterwards Duke of Buckingham, was brought forward to succeed and supplant the undeserving Earl of Summerset in the favor of King James, it was Abbot alone who could persuade Queen Anne to lend her influence. When Villiers came to give him thanks, he counselled him only to pray for the prosperity of the King, to speak to him the truth only, and to study the union of the royal family. But Robert Abbot was soon removed to the grave; the cause of the Elector Palatine was concluded; the powerful clergymen who disliked the administration of the Archbishop, grew more powerful, notwithstanding the Council of Dort; and a most distressing accident prefaced for Abbot an old age of much pain and weariness.

It was in July, 1621, that he was with Lord Zouch at Bramshill Park, amusing himself with the crossbow. Just as he aimed an arrow, a game-keeper suddenly passed on horseback among the deer, received the shaft in his arm, and died within an hour. The hunting was innocent, and the homicide was blameless. A frivolous question was agitated, whether he was incapacitated by some old Canon for his functions; and the temper of the rising party of Laud was favorable to doubts of

such an origin. But the learned and pious Andrews, from whom Abbot had dreaded opposition, nobly defended him from censure. Four Bishops elect, however, who were awaiting consecration before the opinions of the Canonists were quite settled, received it from Bishop Mountaine of London. Abbot had retired to an almshouse which he had built at Guildford, his birthplace; but after an Ecclesiastical Commission, empowered by the King, had pronounced him free from all suspicion of irregularity, he returned to Lambeth and his office, and published a brief "Apology." He gave a pension to the widow of the man, and kept a monthly fast on that day of the month, as long as he lived.

His infirmities soon became so oppressive, especially the gout and stone, that for several years he could not stand, or go up and down stairs without assistance. From a region of comparative retreat, he looked abroad with no unconcerned eye on the mighty events which were thickening far and near; the Thirty Years' War on the Continent; the settlement of America; the preparations of the English Parliament and people for their great struggle. When James would have obtained a Spanish princess in marriage for his son, and was ready to promise, as a condition of the treaty, entire freedom for the Romish worship, Abbot, in a bold and honest letter, warned him of the ills of such an alliance, and of the results of such an attempt to dispense with the laws, without the action of the Parliament. He presided at the coronation of Charles the First; but all ecclesiastical sway passed rapidly into the engrossing hands of Bishop Laud; and the Primate was seldom heard, except when he remonstrated, in a tone of injured, and even of querulous feeling, against some advance in the march of innovation or some new doctrine of unlimited obedience. Charles sent to him the sermon of Sibthorpe in defense of the legality of forced loans, and desired his license for its publication, and was refused. The Bishop of London then licensed it; and the King appointed a Commission, consisting of that Bishop, and the chief Arminian prelates, Laud, Neile, Buckeridge and Howson, to sequester him from all his jurisdiction. He was also dismissed into a kind of banishment at one of his houses. Immediately he wrote a "Narrative" of the true cause of his sequestration, which was, he said, that he would be "no man's servant but the King's;" and thus enlisted against Buckingham and his ecclesiastical dependents, he was more popular than before. When the King felt the security of propitiating the public mind before the Parliament of 1628, Abbot was restored to an appearance of favor.

Abroad, he was the venerable patriarch, of a Church which under him, was heard as the foremost representative of the Reformation. His heart was with the Protestants of France; he sent his Vicar-general to Venice to secure the sheets of the History of the Council of Trent at their first appearance; and he held a correspondence with Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople. But at home, it is not strange that he felt the disrespect of those who were waiting for his successor. He had built a conduit at great charge in the city of Canterbury, and designed to have left a revenue for its maintenance; but changed his purpose when the Mayor and others had inflicted a wound on his feelings. The University of Oxford, and Balliol, and University Colleges numbered him among their benefactors. He reached the age of seventy-one, and then died at Croydon; and, by his own desire, was interred in Trinity Church, at Guildford, where he had worshiped in childhood beside his good father and mother.

On the first appearance of Bishop Laud at Court, after the death of Abbot, the King saluted him with these words, "My Lord's Grace of Canterbury, you are welcome." Ten days after, some person who seemed to be authorized from Rome, privately offered him the dignity of a Cardinal. He at once communicated the offer to the King, and said with a singular moderation, sufficient to explain the proposal, that "somewhat dwelt within him, which would not suffer that, till Rome were other than it was." On the very day on which he was confirmed in the Primacy, a King's letter, composed by him, was issued, warning the Bishops against the ordination of any person without a title or charge, a measure directed against the lecturers who were supported by the Puritans. Once at Lambeth, he aspired to the complete accomplishment of all which he had wished for the Church; for the Church which he loved and served with all his heart, though with too little wisdom, meekness or gentleness. Long before, he had prepared a catalogue of important designs, many of which he was able in the course of years to execute. He enriched the University of Oxford with collections of coins and manuscripts; founded an Arabic Professorship, and procured the connection of a Canonry of Christ Church with the Hebrew, and another with the office of Public Orator; erected an edifice at the end of the Divinity School; obtained the Caroline Charter, and framed the statutes. For the University of Dublin, also, of which he was Chancellor, he obtained a new charter, and procured the allotment to the Irish Church of the Irish impropriations residing in the crown. He wished to annex settled bene-

fices to smaller sees, and did it for Bristol, Peterborough, St. Asaph, Chester and Oxford. He obtained a new charter for Reading, his birthplace, gave it an annual revenue of two hundred pounds, and presented the advowson of St. Laurence's Church to his own College. He began the settlement of the statutes of the new Cathedrals, and finished those of Canterbury. Large were his plans, and large the means which he gathered to their aid.

A favorite task of Laud was that of reducing the services throughout the realm to a stricter order, and restoring customs which might impress the sentiments of local holiness and sacramental efficacy. In all ecclesiastical affairs, he ruled the King, and guided the Council. It was decided that the custom of the cathedral should govern the diocese. The table was to be at the eastern wall of the Chancel, with candlesticks, a basin, a carpet and other furniture, and they who approached it were to bow as they came. At Lambeth and at Croydon, under his eye, a painting on canvas appeared behind the altar; side tables were prepared; and copes adorned with figures and embroidery, were furnished for the officiating clergy. The Book of Martyrs and Jewel's Reply to Harding, were removed from the Churches: and a reprint of Becon's Rising of the Popish Man was suppressed. Several clergymen were suspended by the Primate for not bowing at the name of JESUS. His own book of devotion was digested according to the ancient canonical hours. Yet, Laud promoted the scheme of Davy for the union of the Protestant Churches; and while he owned in his adversity that he had hoped to have effected in due time the natural reconciliation of the Churches of England and Rome, he yet declared it as the judgment of all Protestants that "to live and die in the Roman persuasion was great peril of damnation;" he encountered the Jesuit Fisher with acute and convincing argument; and he affirmed that he had personally reclaimed or saved from Popery, more than twenty persons of note; such as his kinsman, Sir William Webb; his godson, Chillingworth; the Duke of Buckingham; Lord Mayo and the Marquis of Hamilton.

He was austere in all his habits. To a lady whose face was painted, he said with a roughness which was somewhat his custom, that "she had plastered herself well." A young clergyman whom, at a visitation, he reproved for some excess in dress, with an allusion to his own attire, returned the shrewd answer, "My Lord, you have better clothes at home, and I have worse." He was himself a strict observer of the Lord's Day; but when the justices in Somersetshire ordered the suppression of Sunday wakes, Laud, jealous of Puritan-

ism and of all encroachment on his sphere, complained to the Council; and the Book of Sports was revised, and directed to be read in all Churches. The shocking spectacle was seen, of pious and useful clergymen suspended from their office, for what they deemed a refusal to contradict the fourth commandment, just after reading it from their chancels.

In the Church he was almost supreme. He nominated the prelates; he received reports from their Dioceses; he dispensed rewards; he executed penalties; he overshadowed the Universities; he proposed charters and canons; he required conformity, even from the children of foreigners; he would have intercepted the fleeing Puritans, and have stretched his authority across the ocean. King Charles, under his counsels, attempted to reduce the Scottish Church to a resemblance, as close as might be, to the English; and Laud was virtually the patriarch of the three Kingdoms. In an evil hour for himself and for religion, he accepted, if he did not seek, that control in civil affairs, which it was the weakness of Charles that he was willing to bestow on an ecclesiastic. He was made first Commissioner of the Treasury, and was in truth, the Prime Minister, sustaining the King in his fatal plan of governing without a Parliament. But he found himself embarked in business with which he was unacquainted; at variance with his associates in office; disliked by the lawyers, and the prey of interested contractors; and after a year of office, he advised the King to dissolve the Commission, and give the post of Lord Treasurer to his friend, Bishop Juxon. "Now," he wrote in his diary, "if the Church will not hold up themselves under God, I can do no more." As if, in turbulent times, when the hearts of half the nation were becoming alienated, the Church was thus to stand!

It was the misfortune of Laud, that while he still provoked against himself all its enemies and many of its friends, and while, placing himself in the very front of the counselors of arbitrary power, he entered a path, the end of which had always been the scaffold,—he attached to himself no company of grateful and affectionate adherents. In another age, he might have ruled in peace; but he could never have been beloved. Repulsive in his manners, peevish under contradiction, cold except when irritated, he found none but adversaries; for the friends of Episcopacy seem never to have rallied cordially around him. He pursued Bishop Williams with a bitterness which seemed oppressive and unrelenting. The inhuman maimings which Leighton and Prynne, Bast-

wick and Barton were condemned to suffer, drew against him the resentment of the learned profession and a storm of popular hatred; since he had at least approved the sentences.

But now the Liturgy was introduced at Edinburgh, with the changes suggested by Laud; a tumult followed; the whole realm arose; and in a few months, the mass of the Scottish people were arrayed under the covenant, and their Episcopacy was utterly overthrown. It was rebellion; and at the prospect of war the Archbishop was alarmed too late. He was blamed for his pusillanimity in opposing the appeal to arms; and thenceforth perceived that the tempest which was closing around his sovereign and himself, was not to be dispelled by counsels like his own. When a Parliament at length met, in the spring of 1640, because Charles could no longer dispense with its aid, Laud received the candid Hyde to his confidence, but declined his advice, when he besought him to counsel the King against a hasty dissolution. A hasty dissolution had place; the Convocation still sat, preparing Canons of doubtful legality; when placards appeared in public places on Saturday, threatening an attack on Monday upon the palace of Lambeth, and calling on the apprentices to meet in St. George's Fields, to hunt "William the Fox, the breaker of the Parliament." The trainbands kept the peace by day, but at night, five hundred rioters surrounded the walls, and were only repelled by the military preparation of the unhappy Primate. One youth was hanged and quartered, as a traitor. The diary of Laud now recorded his ominous dreams, to which he gave even a superstitious significance. He sat in the High Commission Court at St. Paul's in the autumn of the same year, when two thousand persons rushed into the consistory, and tore up the benches, crying, "No Bishop, no High Commission!" On the eve of St. Simon and St. Jude, entering his study, he saw his picture lying upon its face on the floor, the string having broken; and immediately recorded the omen.

Another Parliament had been summoned within the following week; for Charles could govern no longer without supplies; and well might Laud be afraid of the resentment of the Commons of England. Strafford was first impeached; but a week before Christmas a deputation appeared at the bar of the House of Lords, to charge the Archbishop of Canterbury with high treason in attempting to subvert the laws and religion of the nation. He was permitted to visit his house at Lambeth, and remained there till evening, to avoid the gaze of the populace. At the evening prayer in the Chapel, he

heard with comfort the ninety-third and ninety-fourth Psalms, and the fiftieth chapter of Isaiah; the Psalms and Lessons appointed for the evening; then, followed by the blessings of the poor whom he had fed, went away to the house of the Usher, and in six weeks after was committed to the Tower. His old adversary, Prynne, was permitted to search his papers; he saw Lord Strafford on the way to execution, blessed him and fainted; and four desolate years passed over him, while first in Parliament, and then in the field, his sovereign battled to give him freedom. The struggle was not yet decided; when the aged Archbishop now seventy-three years old, was at length indicted. Courageously and well did he vindicate himself with Hale at his side; for indeed he had committed no treason, and his condemnation would have been an outrage on the laws. Therefore, the easier mode of an attainder was chosen; when it passed the Lords, only seven or eight were present; and a vindictive cruelty even sentenced him to be hanged, though it consented afterwards to substitute the nobler punishment. The last scene of his life was the greatest. While we read it, all which we ever blamed is forgotten; his zeal, his firmness, his munificence, his generous patronage of the learned, his own devout life, are fresh in our remembrance; and his calm dignity, his meek reply to the foes who reminded him of his exercise of power, or asked an account of his faith, his florid, touching prayers, place him among the noblest of Christian sufferers. His cheeks were singularly ruddy when he stood upon the scaffold; and it was characteristic, that even then, he blamed the executioner for suffering the boards so to lie that his blood might drop upon the heads of the people. His last words were, "Lord, receive my soul;" and the axe fell. Canterbury, Lambeth, and Croydon, where he had loved to receive the visits of his neighbors, were no longer the seats of an Archbishop; and his body was laid in the Church of Allhallows, Barking, but was afterwards transferred to the Chapel of his own College, St. John's, at Oxford.

ART. IV.—THE ROCK OF THE CHURCH.

FOR the full illustration of a single word it seemed requisite, in the former article, to turn a little out of our direct course, in order to notice what we do not hesitate to call, the prejudices of the disciples as long as they appear only in that relation. Though not necessary to the completeness of the argument, yet a reference to these prejudices, which adhered to them more or less until the day of our Lord's ascension, at least, is necessary to elucidate the true value of Peter's confession, and the force of our Lord's high commendation. Without a reference to these, we might be tempted to ask, what singular merit or virtue could there be in this declaration of Peter, to elicit such praise? but all is clear and consistent, when we remember, that the faith of the disciples had not yet reached the perfect day.

In our estimate of the character and views of the disciples, we are apt, indeed, to confound the two distinct relations of the disciple and the Apostle; and to apply what belongs to the latter, also, to the former. But this would be like some, who judge of ancient times by modern, and transfer the familiar scenes of the present, to what was totally unknown in times of old. The disciples, as long as they walked with JESUS, were in reality only disciples, or *learners*, and the very relation of the learner, supposes many a lesson to be learned, many an error to be corrected, and many a prejudice to be removed. We find, therefore, repeated instances of their yet unformed views on many points of great importance. Our Lord, in reference to this state of mind, announced to them there were, "many things he had to say," but they could not bear them yet, and it was only after the effusion of the Spirit, that their darkness became light.

There can be no doubt then, that every one of the disciples believed firmly what Peter, as their spokesman, declared before them all, that JESUS was the Messiah; but none of them could as yet separate from this, the idea that he would be a temporal prince. They had enough before them, to convince them, JESUS is the CHRIST, and that conviction was enough to cover the whole ground, to bear down the tacit objection ever ready to burst forth: "why does he not declare himself and rally all Israel around his standard?" Yet, that such tacit questions would, like bubbles, arise and seek for some explosion, can be no more doubted than the fact that they were Jews.

But from these general grounds, let us, to satisfy ourselves fully on the meaning of an important word, turn to a particular examination of the sacred text. Here we necessarily look first to the grammar. Grammar, indeed, is not always an infallible umpire, and even in the best writers it may be necessary to allow occasionally for inaccuracies or oversights; yet, this at the same time, is our first guide, and like the literal meaning, never to be deserted unless absolute necessity compels us. And here then, we ask first of all, what is the meaning of the word *this*, (*ταυτη*)? All grammar makes this pronoun refer not to a second person, but to a third person, or object, as something spoken *of*, not spoken *to*, and if the words "Upon this rock" did not, in the present instance, happen to be in a juxtaposition with an address in the second person, no one would ever have surmised that it could possibly refer to a second person. It is only from the juxtaposition, that such a sense could obtain at all. The impression of the second person so distinctly stamped upon the first clause, "Thou art Peter," has thus too easily influenced the sense in the second clause, "Upon this rock," and passed over into a second person also. But however liable the sense is thus to be biased by this juxtaposition, the grammar here has a right to be heard; and this declares such a sense to be a violation of the principles of language. Juxtaposition alone, and it is in this case nothing more, can never decide against a general grammatical principle. It may come in as an auxiliary; it can never be appealed to as a judge independently of the form or the precise term. Now it is a little singular that this juxtaposition is the only ostensible ground on which the expression "this rock" has been made to refer to the person addressed. This juxtaposition has been allowed to bribe the judgment, and because there was a second person in the first clause, there must be a second person in the second clause! If, however, our LORD had really intended the expression to refer to the second person, i. e., to Peter to whom he addressed himself, we naturally expect also the form, the grammatical form of the second person to be continued, and instead of turning aside to use the word *this*, that He would go on in the same person and say "thee." The latter form also, being the more obvious of the two, is also naturally expected by every hearer. But instead of this obvious form, we have a strange form introduced, strange I say, to express an idea that it could not in grammar mean. What then must be our conclusion, but that our LORD could not by this third person mean a second?

There is no instance on record where the demonstrative pronoun "*this*" is used to denote a second person. The exclamation $\Omega \beta\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ indeed occurs ; but besides that, it is turning aside as addressed to some second person, refers to some third person, and is an expression of contempt. The very circumstance, indeed, that our LORD is addressing Peter, leads us to expect a subject of discourse, and that must be in the third person, unless distinctly designated to be in any other. In the first clause of this address, he both speaks *to* Peter and *of* Peter ; each in the second person. "I say unto thee, That thou art Peter," but in the second clause there is a formal transition to the *third* person, "Upon this rock I will build." Can anything in language be clearer, that the two distinct persons refer to two distinct objects ? The argument might be extended ; but we pass to other grounds furnished by the kindred departments of philology.

The Greek reader knows that there are two cognate words in the two clauses in question, which express two different ideas, $\pi\epsilon\tau\rho\varsigma$ and $\pi\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha$, the one a derivative of the other. The former of these words, $\pi\epsilon\tau\rho\varsigma$ if we consult the original Syriac of which it is a translation, means not merely *a* stone, but the substance *stone* ; the other, $\pi\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha$, means a solid mass of the same substance, resting or firmly fixed in the earth, i. e., a rock. Now after the commendation passed upon his disciple, our LORD addresses him anew, and then significantly applies this surname, Stone. And in this instance He clearly applies it as a commendation in addition to what he had just said, as we may see by the solemn form in which He introduces it. The significant application of this surname in the connection where it stands, was, if any thing designed allusively to declare and applaud his enduring firmness amid the discouragements of his faith, and in spite of the very prejudices of his own mind, a firmness that well accorded with the title he had received, and the character he developed ; well mayest thou be called Peter ! The allusion to firmness and endurance is so clear, that it would seem a waste of words to prove it. The hint is sufficient.

The durability of stone makes it also the fittest material for the foundation of the edifice, as well as for the superstructure ; and stone, therefore, is not only emblematic of solidity of character, it is also the fittest emblem of the solid basis on which lasting excellence must rest. After the allusion to Peter's firmness in the emphatic use of his surname, Stone ; the emblematic durability of this substance, receives a new application as our LORD turns to the subject of discourse, "Upon this

rock I will build," &c. In the Greek text, this appears at first as that rhetorical figure called paronomasia or alliteration, one word from resemblance suggesting the use of another. This we shall show is not the case here. The figure, it is true, occurs very often, especially in the prophetic writings of the Old Testament, and often adds beauty and force. It is not, however, in Scripture, what it is often elsewhere, a mere play upon words where terms are often used from the mere resemblance of sound, and very little in sense, and more for fancied wit and amusement than solid instruction; but the paronomasia of Scripture is marked by strength and impressiveness, with the prominent object of fixing important truth in the mind, as it gives life and brilliancy to the thought. Thus, also, as aid to the memory, it is often the happy vehicle of revelation. Analogies of sound were aids to convey or impress the analogies of truth.

But frequent as the figure is in the Hebrew Scriptures, and ever grave and dignified, impressive and brilliant as it is there, still it is not the figure that occurs here. It was not the analogy of sound, or of words that suggested a new idea, it was a new sense given to the same word, a new meaning to the same sound. The alliteration, if such it could be called, belongs only to the Greek text. We must go to our LORD's vernacular tongue to see his words in their freshness and force, or at least to aid a just conception of our inspired Greek. In the old Peshito, the earliest translation of the New Testament for the Syrian Church, there is but one word for the two that occur in the Greek. The word *Kepho*, of which *Cephas* is a modification, is the same in both clauses.

This would seem at first to be *prima facie* evidence of the identity of objects from the identity of names. Indeed this very argument has been used to prove that it was thus the purport of the passage to pronounce Peter the rock. But this is a fallacy. Identity of terms does not always prove identity of things. When it is said, "let the dead bury their dead," the same word certainly does not convey the same idea in both cases, or apply to the same persons. Thus no inference can be drawn from the identity of words in the oriental dialect, to refer us to Peter. On the contrary, the very example just cited of the different senses attached to the same word in such close juxtaposition, furnishes ground to expect similar application in similar cases. Now of this very remark, our Greek text gives the happiest illustration. Our authoritative Greek gives, of course, a faithful transcript of the original oriental word. How happens it then, that the oriental original which is but one,

is given in the Greek text by two distinct words? Is it not clearly because the sacred writer understood this one word, in the two different applications, to convey two different ideas? and to apply, like the example above cited, to two different objects? Nothing can be plainer; the Syriac furnishes the oriental form, the authoritative Greek expounds it, and gives us the two cognate words *πετρος* and *πετρα* for the one Kepho.

Hence we see, also, there is here no supposed play upon words or sounds, as some have piously and profanely said; nay, not even the grave paronomasia of Scripture; it is, if any thing, and we may be allowed to coin a new term, rather a tautonomasia, a new and higher application of the same word to express a more important idea than could be attached to the surname of Peter. This tautonomasia, the complete reverse of all tautology, did not, as we see, take new words to express, perhaps one barren thought, or give the same thing in different words; it was enriching terms with new and nobler thoughts; raising new and elevated views on long established names, and thus enlarging the moral with the intellectual capacity of man, by imparting the freshness of extraordinary thought to ordinary speech. The Syriac, then, instead of furnishing ground to apply the word Rock to Peter, when compared with the authoritative Greek text and the interpretation which this gives us, not only neutralizes that application, but absolutely requires another; and as there is only one other, it will be obvious what that is. We have already in part anticipated this; but before we draw that conclusion which we consider already justified if not demanded, we shall, to obviate any undue inferences, further remark on the force of the Syriac, that what has been said on the identity of the word in both clauses, might appear inconclusive, because in the Syriac there is a pronominal adjective of different gender used before the word Kepho, in each clause. According to this, the first clause may be rendered from the Syriac, "thou art *that* Peter"—where the pronominal adjective is masculine. The second clause is rendered as the Greek, "upon *this* rock." The different reference here indicated by the pronouns *that* and *this*, must strike every one, and seems intended, if any thing, to mark the difference of objects yet still stronger than the Greek. It is thus a remarkable coincidence in the two earliest translations of our Lord's original words, that there should appear in the very face of the sacred text, in both of these instances, such an evident effort to make the difference appear by as precise a version, as strict fidelity would permit. And we are not without the

hope that the notice of this coincidence will, in some degree, compensate for the unavoidable dryness of such a discussion. The Syriac, it is true, is itself only a translation from the authoritative Greek, and must be regarded chiefly as an expounder of that text. But at the same time, if we can not absolutely assert that it gives us, as a translation from the Greek, the identical form of the once living word, as uttered by our LORD, it must at least be viewed as the nearest, happiest approximation. And here it is striking, that in the process of returning the expression to its original form, as it flowed from the lips of JESUS, this version has even gone beyond the Greek in precision, and as if to forestall any confusion of ideas, any mingling or confounding of Peter with the true rock, has introduced the pronoun *that* in contradistinction to *this*, "that Peter" emphatically distinguished from "this rock." Have we not, then, here the strongest internal evidence that the two first versions of our LORD's words, one almost coeval with the other, clearly recognize the different reference of each clause of the passage, and that by interpreting as well as translating, they mean to express the difference? It would seem, indeed, as if these two high authorities were rivaling each other in their aim to caution us against an erroneous construction, viz: of confounding Peter with what Peter had said, or of identifying him with his confession. Before we leave this ground, we may add, without laying any stress upon the remark, that the copulative conjunction in the Syriac following the Hebrew idiom, is sometimes adversative in sense, and this is then transferred to the Greek *καὶ*. This, of course, only marks the distinction with greater force.

In duly estimating the force of what our Lord says to Peter, it is of great importance to the argument, to observe the parallel between the confession and our LORD's emphatic address. Peter had said "Thou art the CHRIST," &c. JESUS, as a parallel to this, takes up the very words of the confession in the more emphatic form, "I say unto thee, That thou art Peter," &c. No one can doubt that it is full of meaning. There is allusion in the form—there is allusion in the terms. The form refers back to the form of Peter's confession; the term, Peter refers to the firmness which that confession indicates. Peter, had declared his own conviction that JESUS is the CHRIST. JESUS in return, declares what his disciple was, by the simple emphatic allusion to the signification of his name, a name, or rather a title he had given him, and which the passing incident so happily illustrated and justified. There is, then, in this very declaration, "Thou art Peter," a direct reference or

allusion to the confession just made and commended. Without this, indeed, there is no object in it, and we are then in danger, not only of losing the force of our LORD's words, but what is more, of making them mere words. Nay, we lose even the fitness and beauty of this emphatic declaration, the sense itself evaporates, and we seem to have *vox et præterea nihil!* Now if we are not to encounter such an absurdity, then the last idea that lingers in the mind as we ponder the words, "Thou art Peter," is the confession which had been made, and the last idea we carry with us to the second clause as the only true key to the declaration, "Upon this rock." Nothing can be more evident, if we take the words of the first clause in their allusive force, referring back to what Peter had said, and carry this with us to what follows. In any other view it must be confessed, no solid reason can be assigned why such an emphatic form of words is used; but with Peter's confession as the hinge on which the sentence turns, all is consistent, beautiful and strong.

Perhaps it might occur to some, on reading the context, that however consistent all this may be, yet as we pass on to that promise of our LORD respecting the keys, (v. 19,) "I will give thee the keys," &c. we seem to stumble upon a difficulty that weakens the force of all our reasoning, or perhaps, completely overturns it. Without stopping to determine the precise meaning of "the keys" in this passage, we are bold to say, that instead of any objection arising from the tenor of this promise, it furnishes strong internal evidence in favor of our views. The objection that occurs, perhaps is this, that as our LORD proceeds in his address, with this solemn promise to Peter, he seems to have Peter altogether in view; and as we clearly must refer this last promise (v. 19) to Peter, so we must refer "this rock" to the same person.

But we answer to this, that if our LORD had meant to refer to the same person or thing, in the expression "this rock," and the promise "I will give *thee*," the natural flow of style would have required the use of the same person; i. e. the third person; and grammatical consistency at least would have demanded the form, "I will give *him*," and the language would then seem very properly in this part addressed aside to the rest of the disciples, as said to them respecting Peter. But instead of this, our LORD has no sooner given utterance to the words "this rock," in the third person, than he returns to the second person, expressly referring to Peter, "I will give *thee*." What can be plainer in the natural exposition of language than this, that the change from one person to another

refers to a different thing? If but one object in this address to Peter had been in our LORD's view, the natural connection of sentences does assuredly require the obvious use of the same person throughout, in order to know, at least, whether a person or thing is spoken *to*, or spoken *of*. Any change in this respect, is proof there is reference to a different object.

Again, the keys themselves, whatever we may understand by these, certainly mean something, as a figure, at least, of far less importance than the rock. To be the rock of the Church, embraces every thing. It is the foundation on which all rests, and all depends. If Peter, then, were this rock, every thing else in the kingdom of God was implied in that single title. But in that case, could it add any thing yet to his dignity or importance to make him also, as some absurdly have made him, (*sit venia verbi!*) also the door keeper? And are we consequently to paint him, as is sometimes done, sitting before the gates of heaven, to admit or exclude at will, whom he pleases, whilst at the same time, we are to believe he is the very rock of this kingdom—for the Church is nothing else? But we must admit all this, if we make him this rock; we make the words of JESUS, designed as they really were, to confer additional honor and to elevate the disciple by this promise, instead of this, actually leaving him to an inferior position; not to mention the strange confusion of figures, which this mingling of the two beautiful metaphors creates; which, referred clearly to their respective objects, stand nobly forth and give us light, but confounded in one, involve us in the same confusion and darkness. The truth is, they can not mix; we may stir them, perhaps, like oil and water, with some magic wand to produce a momentary mechanical compound, but the delusion is momentary; the oil and the water separate; truth soon asserts its rights; Peter is not incapacitated for the keys by being made the rock; and this rock remains in its distinct position a surer foundation, than man could lay, or mere man could be.

Thus, as we rapidly glance at the ground here reviewed, we believe there is more than sufficient reason to deny the propriety of applying the word *rock* to Peter. He is, *stone* or even *rock* if you please, as emblematic of character, not that rock of which Jesus spoke, the Rock of the Church. The common sense, and even the prejudices of the Jewish mind are against it; the literal sense enforced by grammar and philology is against it; the translations both of Greek and Syriac are against it; and every closer inspection of the sacred text shows it to be untenable.

On the contrary, when we look at the one unvaried subject, on which every thing turns in every verse and sentence, from beginning to end, of the whole paragraph, whether in allusions or express terms; the natural connection between the elogium of our LORD and the confession of Peter; the necessary reference to that confession when our LORD takes up its very form as if its parallel; we seem compelled by every consideration to refer to that as the rock upon which the Church should rise. Indeed, when we take a survey of all these grounds, negative and positive as they are, it seems surprising that any other sense should prevail than this. The confession, then, the confession which Peter here made is the rock to which all reference is made. The first question (v. 13) refers to this; the answer of the disciples (v. 14) refers to this; the question again (v. 15) refers still to this; Peter's answer (v. 16) is the confession itself; the answer of JESUS (v. 17) is the blessing and commendation on account of the confession; the emphatic parallel to Peter's confession, (v. 18,) even without the clause, "upon this rock," refers back to the same; the promise (v. 19) is based entirely on the confession; and the last verse, (20,) as if to constrain the most obstinate to confess that this confession is the true rock on which CHRIST'S Church is built, yet reminds us of the caution our LORD deemed it necessary to give, yet for a time on this very point: "that they should tell no man that he was JESUS the CHRIST."

We have thus redeemed the pledge of showing some reference or allusion to this confession in every verse of the section. We believe the point is proved on grounds, which seem to us in such cases, little short of demonstration. Our critical perception must be very different from others, if a fair examination does not make a similar impression on all who take the pains. We know there are great names, fathers, ancient and modern, whose authority has decided differently; but there are also other fathers, ancient and modern, whose critical acumen was not inferior, who have with equal authority decided for the confession. We might here give some illustrious instances of the latter, even from the Church of Rome; but such a question can not be decided by mere votes. We must look into the sacred text, and with all the aids which Providence has given us, earnestly search. The promise that we shall find if we seek, is not in vain.

We need scarcely remark in conclusion, that what has been here asserted as the true rock also accords with historical fact. It was this confession, that JESUS is the CHRIST, that was laid as the foundation every where, as the Apostles

went forth to proclaim the gospel. The first thing presented to the mind of every new convert was, believe in the LORD JESUS CHRIST. Every believer was a believer first of all in this as the basis of his faith: "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, JESUS CHRIST," said St. Paul to the Corinthians, on this very point, (1 Cor. iii.) when divided seemingly between Paul and Appollos, Cephas and CHRIST. Nay, St. Peter himself, as if the error had sprung up even in his day, or as if he anticipated some delusion like it, such as history has exhibited; St. Peter himself, who has been so confidently proclaimed the Rock of the Church, has left, perhaps, some of the strongest testimony against it. In the second chapter of his first Epistle, on the genuineness of which there has never been any doubt, he has left a remarkable section of five verses, (from the 4th to the 8th,) in every one of which, as if in allusion to his own title, Stone, he refers them to CHRIST as "the living Stone;" speaks of his brethren as "lively stones," refers again to CHRIST as "the Chief Corner Stone, elect and precious;" again to "the Stone which the builders disallowed;" "the head of the corner;" and lastly, "a Stone of stumbling," "a rock of offense," as if to caution all to beware of applying to him, what in one sense could apply only to CHRIST, and in another sense was common to all true members of the great moral and spiritual structure.

Peter was, indeed, a stone, a living stone, built upon the great foundation, like his fellow Apostles; but to make him the rock, the foundation itself, is not only to violate the very elements of language, but in fact, to lose the true Rock himself. St. Paul protests against it; St. Peter himself argues indirectly against it; and we are thus left to the only conclusion warranted by history, philology, Scripture, and reason, that however much we honor him as the Apostle and servant of CHRIST,—honor him especially for his confession in the midst of so much discouragement, still, neither he nor any other saint can be the foundation on which we build; and hence, whoever may claim him as their foundation, must still allow, that "their Rock is not as our Rock, the enemies themselves being witness."

BUSHNELL'S CHRISTIAN NURTURE.

ART. V.—*Views of Christian Nurture, and of Subjects adjacent thereto.* By HORACE BUSHNELL. 12mo. pp. 252. Hartford, 1847.

WE shall probably but utter the sentiments of a great number of persons, in saying that this is, in many respects, one of the most remarkable books, that has lately proceeded from the religious press. And the history of the work is scarcely less remarkable than the work itself. The two "Discourses on Christian Nurture" with which the book opens, were written at the suggestion of a ministerial association, on account of some opinions which had been expressed by Dr. Bushnell on another occasion, and the association united in a request that they should be printed. Some members of the "Massachusetts Sabbath School Society," having heard of the fame thereof, solicited permission for their Society to publish the work, as one of its series of books relating to Christian instruction. The request was granted, and the manuscript forwarded to Boston. After having been examined by the several members of a large Committee, most of whom we believe are Ministers, and having been twice returned to the author for slight emendations, which were made by him, the work was published. It attracted little attention at first among the "orthodox," but having been noticed with a degree of favor by some Church papers, and also by some Unitarian, the fears of certain leaders of opinion among the Congregationalists in Connecticut and Boston were aroused, and such a commotion excited, that it was deemed prudent by the Directors of the "Massachusetts Sabbath School Society," to withdraw the work from sale, and for weeks not a copy could be had for love or money. Such treatment of his intellectual offspring, Dr. Bushnell did not much relish, and he addressed to this Committee, a long and elaborate argument in defense of the principles of his "Discourses." Subsequently Dr. B. (he having reserved the right to do so when he surrendered the manuscript,) published the "Discoursés" with the "Argument," connecting therewith various Essays and Sermons which had been produced at different times, all tending to illustrate and confirm the doctrine of the "Discourses." We may say of them, that they are a series of efforts to place the work of promoting and extending religion on a high philosophical ground, to unite and harmonize the various phenomena con-

nected therewith, and to correct the tendencies to fanaticism, which so abundantly prevail in connection with the popular views on the subject. There is a manliness, a comprehensiveness, a richness and fertility of thought in the book, which commands respect and renders the whole attractive.

And here we can not forbear remarking, in respect to the "Discourses on Christian Nurture," or the Christian education of children, that it is refreshing to see such views proceeding from such a quarter. The *practical* principles enforced, are, in most respects, similar to those which characterize the Christian teaching of the Church system, and for which the Church has always contended. Dr. Bushnell assumes, as the great principle of Christian nurture, "that a child is to grow up a Christian," and not to be trained up to live some years in sin, that he may be converted when he has grown up; that the supernatural grace which renews the child's soul, may be imparted at an early period, and made effective before the development of any conscious moral self-determination of the will; and that such an expectation should be cherished by the Christian parent, and all education based upon it. The *practical* suggestions in connection herewith are valuable, and such as may be applied with benefit by all Christian parents. The following passage is so truthful and judicious, and bears so directly on a point in which the customs of the Church are peculiarly open to the reproach of our neighbors of the sects, that we can not forbear extracting it:

"What careful minister, seeing how many are gathered round him, in the church, who manifest no real love to God in the practical duties of life, and have never shown any Christian character, save that they once were subjects of a religious rhapsody, has not often staggered under the suspicion of some dismal error, in the current views of religious experience.

"For myself, I feel obliged, in faithfulness to God, to declare, that I have more than a suspicion on this subject. Indeed my own experience as a pastor, connected with the thoughts expressed above, has compelled me to feel that, if a young person or child comes to me, in a time of religious quiet, and simply asks to be admitted as a disciple to the ordinances, disclosing a habit of private devotion, declaring a serious purpose and desire to live a religious life, and indicating a settled spirit of dependence on God for the sustenance of all good exercises, I have a far better and more reliable evidence of Christian character, than any sudden burst of ecstatic emotion towards God can possibly yield. These too, as experience will abundantly show, are the persons who maintain the best examples of piety afterwards. We see too, in such examples, that the more closely piety is wedded to habit, and the more thoroughly it is interwoven with common life, the healthier and firmer is the growth. It wants not great experiences to make great Christians. Between ecstatic flights and godly lives there is no valid connection. But when the spirit of God sanctifies the table and the hearth, and makes the homes temples of piety to childhood, when newness of life begins with education or nurture,

and not in high scenes or explosive changes, then the Church of God growing up, like a nation or empire, from a silent law of increase, in its own nature, becomes a compact organic frame, having the vital spirits, as it is the body, of Christ himself."

But whatever truth there may be in Dr. Bushnell's *practical view*, it is impossible it should be generally received by the Calvinistic body, without a material change of Theology. It involves this great difficulty, that it makes no provision for a *change of the relation of the individual toward God*. Calvinism, like the Theology of the Catholic Church, besides teaching an infection of nature which creates a necessity for the renewal of the heart, (which Dr. Bushnell after a theory of his own admits,) also recognizes mankind as coming into the world under a legal disability, styled in Scripture language "condemnation," which requires a change in the state of the individual toward God, and this change must take place at some point of *time*. The subjective change of personal character involved in the renovation of the soul, is in our view, (and in Dr. Bushnell's) gradual, although sometimes in particular cases, culminating at some specific point of time. But a man must always be either in one relation toward God or another. He must either be in a state of condemnation, or in a state of justification and acceptance with God. Now Calvinism conceives, that the change of relation takes place at *conversion*, or when conscious faith first springs up in the soul, and that before this, the child or the person, is in his natural state of condemnation and spiritual death. Hence the necessity of conceiving of this event, as occurring at some *specific point of time*, and of denying the possibility of any truly spiritual affections antecedent to it. Consequently persons entertaining these views are in the habit of regarding every manifestation of early religious sensibility in children, as either the precursor or the result of conversion; as giving either promise or assurance of a conscious change of the self-determining faculty. Such persons can not believe that there can be a "change of heart," or, to speak more scripturally, a renovation of the soul, unless that effect can be dated from some crisis, occurring at a certain known point of time. The change must be sudden and momentary, else it can not be believed to have taken place. The effect is not conceived possible, as the result of grace imparted and becoming operative antecedent to memory. Consequently, a view of Christian Nurture, which assumes the existence of a spiritual character antecedent to the conscious exercise of faith, and recognizes no point of time when the relation toward God was changed, will necessarily

be looked upon by such, as inadmissible. That this is the case with the view of gradual evolution of good principles which Dr. Bushnell contends for, is plain, for there can be in theory, when these views are realized, no point of time, when the state of the will is characteristically different from what it was in the preceding point of time; while the child or the person being still unregenerate and a child of wrath, must yet be the recipient of Divine grace, and under a process of renovation, which is absurd.

The Churchman has no difficulty in holding to a gradual process of renovation, for while he believes that the relative change is effected in Baptism, that the child is then, "from being a child of wrath, made a child of grace," he also believes that the Fountain of that new life to which the HOLY SPIRIT then admits him, becomes through faith, the first and the efficient cause of the Christian dispositions, which, under the influence of Christian training, we see springing up within him; even as the life of the vine becomes the efficient cause of life in the *branch* engrafted therein.

This difficulty Dr. Bushnell evidently does not feel, and we suppose he avoids it, by denying its fundamental position. This we infer from various portions of the work, though such denial is not distinctly avowed. But the habit of thought among Calvinists and Calvinistic denominations, to which we have referred, is, we think, too firmly fixed, to give way readily to any reasonings which disregard the Theological principle involved; and this will prove a great obstacle to the success of Dr. Bushnell's endeavors to establish among his denomination more correct views of Christian nurture.

While Dr. Bushnell's *practical* views are thus likely to be rejected by his Calvinistic brethren, the *principles* on which he rests them are equally objectionable to the Churchman. The basis of his argument is, that by the constitution of nature, there is an *organic relation* between the parent and the child, so that in early years the character of the child is in some sense included within that of the parent, and hence the parent does, in a certain sense, transmit moral character to the child. There is an organic unity in the family, i. e., each family is an integral body, of which individuals are members, and hence it results that there is a common life in the family, and "the family is such a body, that a power over character is exerted therein, which can not properly be called influence." (p. 185.) This is but the recognition of a principle which pervades our whole life. No one lives merely as

an individual. "God placeth the solitary in families." We come into being as members of the family and the State; as we advance we form new relations, in which our individuality is to a certain extent merged, though individual responsibility is still preserved. No one receives influences by himself, but as a member of a body.

This is evidently the doctrine of Scripture. "By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin." "As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Adam was the organic head of the race: the *judicial* as well as the physiological and moral effects of his transgression, are perpetuated in his posterity. The fact of an organic unity in the race, is what gives such momentous and eternal interest to the history of the fall. It is upon the same principle that the Divine Constitution of Redemption is founded. The curse having come in through one man, and by him being entailed on all descending from him, the Atonement came in by one man, and flows to all who become united to Him. (Romans v: 11-21.) Now the Church doctrine corresponds with and depends upon this declaration of St. Paul. It assumes that the natural relation *by itself*, transmits only condemnation and corruption; that "that which is born of the flesh is flesh;" that we are born in sin, and are "the children of wrath;" that we must be grafted into the Body of CHRIST, in order to be relieved of this natural disability; that the relation of the parent to the child does not impart of itself any spiritual grace or benefit. The organic relation of the parent to the child, gives the former a right to ask the privilege of membership in the Church for the latter, which is obtained when it is brought to Baptism; and then a new relation is constituted—a relation which removes the judicial disability under which the child is born, and places him within the sphere and *under the power* of that supernatural Life which the Church receives from the Head, and conveys to its members. He is thus made "a member of CHRIST, the child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven." If it be said that the grace thus conferred amounts to nothing, (and in these remarks we are making a counter-statement to Dr. Bushnell's representations of the Church doctrine on the subject on p. 204.) we reply, that this can not be assumed, for no one can tell what hidden power may be working in the soul, even of a faithless Christian, which shall be the yet abiding influence of that new Life to which he was united in his Baptism.

But Dr. Bushnell's view makes the organic relation of the parent to the child, not only the cause of the child's becoming a *member of the Church*, but the very means of transmitting a new life. The regenerated life of the parent is to be transmitted to the child, even as his corrupted moral life is. The agency of the HOLY SPIRIT is indeed recognized herein, but it is through this *natural relation* that His grace is supposed to be effectual, and not through the higher and supernatural relation. The relation of the infant child to the Church, is nothing except as involved in the relation of the child to the parent. In fact, any real efficiency of the Church, in promoting and securing the renewal and salvation of the child, is denied. Dr. Bushnell enters somewhat at length into the subject of infant Baptism, and has a long argument to prove its suitability and propriety. But he expressly denies, that it creates or establishes any new relation, or grafts the child into the Body of CHRIST. He uses the following unequivocal language :

"The Church of God is not gathered or organized by Baptism. Baptism simply indicates, or manifests a membership already existing. Therefore, in adults it follows belief." "Every man who bears the Christian fruits, is seen to be in the visible Church of God—Priests, Covenants, Sacraments, all out of the question." "But where now is the faith, the spiritual life presupposed in Baptism when a child is the subject? It is in the parent, I answer, *as the head of an organic unity in the house*, [the italics are ours,] or as it may better suit the Episcopal habit of thought, it is in the Church of God, the body of CHRIST, considered as inhabited and quickened by His SPIRIT, which quickening SPIRIT . . . organizing the whole body, travels through the parent, and *mainly through him*, reaches the child. The child therefore, is in the Church, in virtue of the Church life, as our Episcopal brethren require; for the Church life is but another name for the life of God, which organizes the Church, and sets the past in connection with the future *through the organic laws of the family*." (pp. 203, 204.)

Here it is clearly affirmed, that the blessings of Redemptive supernatural grace, come to the child in its infancy, through its natural relation to the parent; that it is born a member of the Church, and does not need to be made one. This view, of course, denies the Church doctrine of original sin, as involving an entailed and hereditary condemnation, while it makes hereditary the Divine adoption of the parent. And here is one point of divergence. The Church teaches that each individual comes into the world under a legal disqualification, derived by his organic relation to the first man, and that a believing man does *not* transmit his privilege of justification to his children, and so in obedience to her master's injunction, she brings children to the sacrament of Baptism, and by admitting them

to membership in the body of CHRIST, establishes a new relation between them and God, one which secures to them that new life which must renew them unto salvation. Dr. Bushnell overlooks or denies this view of original sin, and makes the spiritual privileges of the parent to descend upon the child. According to him, the child is *not* born in sin; is *not* a child of wrath, and the virtue of CHRIST's sacrifice is transmitted to the child, through the parent, and not through the Church.

But here we might ask, what is the real effect or benefit of Baptism, if it be not to graft into the Body of CHRIST? It is said to be a declaration of a fact supposed to exist; and nothing more. It really *does* nothing. It is significant, it will be said, of the faith of the parent. But the parents who present the child, may, after all, be destitute of faith, and then it is significant of nothing, and must be less than nothing; a merely insignificant procedure; which makes it even a smaller nothing than Dr. Bushnell fancies he has made the Church doctrine of grace in Baptism. It has no inherent motive to its observance, except a sense of propriety; and it will require a stronger perception of proprieties than is felt by the majority of Congregational parents, for such reasoning to induce them to resume the neglected practice of dedicating their children to God in the sacred rite of Baptism. The Baptist arguments against it are plausible and industriously spread, and the question, with which persons of this sect think to shut up the mouths of its defenders, "what good will it do to sprinkle babies?" will not be answered to the satisfaction of plain people, by reasoning so subtle, and we must add far-fetched.

In what Dr. Bushnell has said of the organic relations of the family as a *means of education*, we, for the most part, perhaps entirely, coincide. He has treated the subject forcibly, and in an original manner. Much of what he has written, we could commend to the attention of members of the Church. It may, perhaps, be true, that Episcopalians have erred, as Dr. Bushnell says, "by absorbing the family in a boundless unsparing Churchism," (p. 84,) and that we need to have our perception of parental obligations sharpened. But when we find him, as he does, making the *natural* relation of the family, not only the means of *exercising*, but the organ for *conveying* the spiritual grace, we dissent. We agree with him, that it is not as independent, isolated individuals, that we partake of the grace of the Gospel, but through our corporate relations to the Church of God. But we hold that the organ of the supernatural is itself supernatural; that this organ is THE CHURCH as an objective institute,—an object, not of Sense,

but of Faith; instituted by the Divine Word, continued by the Divine authority transmitted in it, and enlivened by the Divine Presence; and that in order that the supernatural grace may descend upon the natural organism, and make it a means of grace, the family and each member of it must be grafted into the Church.

In all this, we take our stand upon the plain reading of the New Testament. We avow our belief that Christianity does recognize a covenant relation to CHRIST, commencing in an outward rite of human administration, as a condition of the highest blessings. "We believe in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church." "We acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins." This is not a conviction in which Reason takes the initiative: it starts from the point of Faith. Its logical consequences may, in the view of Dr. Bushnell, expose us to charges of bigotry and narrowness, but we can not help it. We must be content with saying, that while it is the only scriptural view of the matter, it is in the highest degree philosophical.

An incidental feature of Dr. Bushnell's book, is the representation it gives of the actual religious condition of the people for whom he writes. He has for years evidently been alive to the evils which Episcopalians and others have seen and pointed out among Congregationalists, and he has been laboring to correct them. The extravagance and fanaticism of what are commonly styled "Revivals," called forth an able article from his pen in the *Christian Spectator* for 1838. More recently, he published in the *New Englander* an equally able article, which is republished in the present volume, under the title of "*Growth, not Conquest, the true method of Christian Progress*;" and it was the avowal herein of his views of Christian Nurture which led to the production of the "Discourses." These views have resulted from reflection on the actual state of religion prevalent in his denomination, and the endeavor to find the remedy. In order, therefore, to enforce his views, he gives occasionally an exhibition of some of the religious defects which he deplores. The following, perhaps, may be cited, as setting forth the general type of religion prevalent among Congregationalists.

"There is a great and lamentable deficiency of what we have called character. We have much to say (not too much) of the heart, the internal principle of religion, and the state of the disciple as related to God. But we either say too little, or what we say has far too little effect, of those charities, those duties of society, of good neighborhood and good citizenship, in which human life is spent,—the kind and graceful feelings, honesty, mercy, gener-

osity,—every thing that is necessary to outward dignity and beauty,—in one word, character. Many Christians seem never to attain to a proper sense of character. Indeed the attainment is a somewhat difficult one, to those who have not been trained to it, in their early education. The Church suffers an immense loss of weight and influence from this source. Those who are called Unitarian Christians, it will be observed, on the other hand, have much to say of character, and less of the distinguishing principle of piety, as internal. Nor is what they say without effect. If they encourage or leave room for the error of supposing that the substance of piety is made up of those individual acts, which are properly only so many manifestations of it, and not of internal principle as related to God, they do at least secure, in many cases, acts and manifestations that extort praise and respect. We have sometimes thought, that if a practical Unitarian and an orthodox disciple could be melted into one, they would make a Christian. This, at least, will do to illustrate our meaning." (pp. 176, 177.)

"We have some good points, in which we compare favorably with other Christians, and Christians of other times, but our style of piety is sadly deficient, in many respects, and that to such a degree that we have little cause for self-congratulation. With all our activity and boldness of movement, there is a certain hardness and rudeness, a want of sensibility to things that do not lie in action, which can not be too much deplored, or too soon rectified. We hold a piety of conquest rather than of love. A kind of public piety that is strenuous and fiery on great occasions, but wants the beauty of holiness, wants constancy, singleness of aim, loveliness, purity, richness, blamelessness, and—if I may add another term not so immediately religious, but one that carries, by association, a thousand religious qualities—wants domesticity of character; wants them, I mean, not as compared with the perfect standard of CHRIST, but as compared with other examples of piety that have been given in former times, and others that are given now.

"For some reason, we do not make a Christian atmosphere about us,—do not produce the conviction that we are living unto God. There is a marvelous want of savor in our piety. It is a flower of autumn, colored as highly as it need be to the eye, but destitute of fragrance. It is too much to hope that, with such an instrument, we can fulfill the true idea of Christian education. Any such hope were even presumptuous. At the same time, there is no so ready way of removing the deficiencies just described, as to recall our Churches to their duties in domestic life; those humble, daily, hourly duties, where the spirit we breathe shall be a perpetual element of power and love, bathing the life of childhood." (pp. 8, 9.)

"The more I reflect on the particular type of practical religion, prevalent in our Churches, for the century now past, the more dissatisfied I am with it. We do not seem to understand that there is a law of population within a nation or an empire—one which, if children were only brought up in the faith, would give a far more rapid increase than we now have, and finally would, by itself, enable the Church to overpopulate and occupy the world, as the Saxon race are occupying the western continent. No addition meets our view, which does not come as conquest." (p. 108.)

We call attention to these representations of the type of religion prevalent among the successors of the Puritans, not as rejoicing in the faults of our neighbors, but for the purpose of self-defense. Every one knows, that it is their habit to claim for themselves almost the monopoly of all piety and spiritual

religion in the land, assuming as they do the title of "Evangelical," and designating all their Societies for religious purposes by the name of "American," as if their's was the religion of the country. It is also as well known, that they regard all (except the extreme of Low Churchmen among Episcopalians) as destitute of spiritual religion, and subject to blindness and formalism. But what says one of themselves, himself an extreme Congregationalist, of the style of their own practical religion? Why, that it is hard, severe, ungraceful, wanting in steadiness and regard for the charities of life. That in every thing that relates to *character*, it falls behind Unitarianism. Now we think all this is true, and we ask whether a religious sect that is open to such reproaches from one of their own number, has any cause for self-gratulation on the score of piety. Whether a religion which exhibits such marked deficiencies, has any claim to be regarded as *par excellence* spiritual. Let us read in this connection the words of an Apostle: "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge, and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing. *Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself; is not puffed up; doth not behave itself unseemly; seeketh not her own; is not easily provoked; thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things; believeth all things; hopeth all things; endureth all things.*" Let the part we have put in italics be compared with Dr. Bushnell's description, and how much would be left as proofs of *charity*.

The following passage covers a still wider ground.

"The very evil that I am now seeking to remedy, is precisely this—a want of the godly habit and of that deep spiritual exercise, which only can suffice to carry on a work of thorough sanctification, in the Christian body. We are, at this very moment, as deep in the spirit of formalism, as we can be, without receiving it theoretically, as a religion. Revivals themselves have sunk into a formality, and what is even more singular, conversions also. Precisely this, is what every intelligent minister feels, though he may not name what he deplors in this manner. What is it but another kind of formalism, to look upon a revival of religion, as the only hopeful instrument of good, the only supposable state of godly living? Nor is it any thing different, if conversions are accepted, as equivalent to Christian character, and the technical evidences of conversion, as the title deed of salvation. A very

slight perusal of our present type of religion will show how little efficacy it has, or can have, to exercise a soul deeply in spiritual things, or to produce a thorough sanctification of character. It will be seen that our religion revolves, practically speaking, about two single points. First, every man is to be converted. Secondly, he is to concern himself about the conversion of others. Or, if this be not a literal and complete truth, you will see what I mean by the statement. The Christian mind is thus withdrawn to a mournful extent, from all bosom struggles and a careful chastening of the spirit, before God. We are not so much responsible to be godly, as to be useful! We do not question so much how we may subdue sin within ourselves, as how we may enlarge the roll of converts! We seldom tremble before God, under the gloomy terrors that rise up in our faithless hearts. When we pray, it is not so much that we may come unto God, for His own sake, as that we may use a profitable expedient! Prayer is a convenience to the execution of our designs upon others. . . .

"The shallowness of such a style of piety is too evident, and facts answer, with deplorable exactness, to what our analysis of causes discovers. We make the faith of God of none effect. At certain points we have a glimmer, if I should not rather say a blaze, of spirituality. But we have no spiritual habit. The grace of the spirit is exhausted, by our religious occasions, and between these, we sink into ourselves, to wait until the gale returns. Now and then, we have a disciple who, against all the power of social causes round him, adheres to God and proves his faithfulness, as a soldier, fighting on by himself. But apart from such examples, our piety consists in a series of reconversions, or salient starts out of lethargy and dreams. There is no Christian continuity, no spiritual habit, no strong warfare that shakes the soul in a conflict of years, and finally crowns it as a spiritual victor and hero." (pp. 241—243.)

And this is the description, drawn not by an enemy but by a friend, of the religion which claims an eminence in spirituality, and regards itself as the great agent for the regeneration of society. How true these statements are, every one who observes, knows. And whoever reads the religious papers, or has examined the religious statistics of the various non-Episcopal denominations, (for there is a family relation among them all,) has noticed, that according to their own rules of judging, they are effecting little or nothing for the advancement of religion in the country. Their reports from year to year, show hardly any increase,—in many cases the number of members added by profession, i. e., by conversion, not exceeding those removed by death and discipline. It is only when the machinery of a revival has been put in operation, that there are more than three or four, on an average, added to their several Churches. This state of things has continued for a long series of years, and there is no prospect of any improvement. Now one would think, such a state of things would awaken a suspicion in the minds of thoughtful persons, that there is something fundamentally wrong in the system. Dr. Bushnell admits that this is the case, and has applied himself to exhibit the evil, and present a remedy.

The fundamental error to which Dr. Bushnell refers the evils he deplotes, is the prevalence of *individualism*, or the theory which regards every man as standing by himself before God and his fellow-men, wholly apart from any *organic* or *corporate* relations. He says :

"The tendency of all our modern speculations is to an extreme individualism, and we carry our doctrines of free will so far, as to make little or nothing of organic laws." (p. 20.)

"In matters of religion, we have burst the bonds of Church authority, and erected the individual mind into a tribunal of judgment within itself, we have asserted free will as the ground of all proper responsibility, and framed our theories of religion so as to justify the incommunicable nature of persons as distinct units. While thus engaged, we have well nigh lost, as was to be expected, the idea of organic powers and relations. The state, the Church, the family, have ceased to be regarded as such, according to their proper idea, and become mere collections of units. A national life, a Church life, a family life, is no longer conceived, or perhaps conceivable by many. Instead of being wrought together and penetrated, to some extent, by historic laws and forces common to all the members, we only seem to lie as seeds piled together, without any terms of connection, save the accident of proximity, or the fact that we all belong to the heap. And thus the three great forms of organic existence, which God has appointed for the race, are in fact lost out of mental recognition. The conception is so far gone that, when the fact of such an organic relation is asserted, our enlightened public will stare at the strange conceit, and wonder what can be meant by a paradox so absurd." (p. 184.)

The remedy for the evil thus induced is supposed to be (and we think rightly) the recognition of the organic relations, and a system of religious means and appliances based thereupon. But now the question arises whether it is possible to correct this evil ; whether the remedy can be applied so extensively, as to effect a general improvement in the Congregational body. Others whom we know, when standing in a position similar to that of Dr. Bushnell, made the same discovery of the prevalent defects in New England religion, and came to the same conclusion as to its cause and remedy ; but the discovery brought the conviction that correction was hopeless, that Puritanism was in a religious point of view, a failure ; that the schism of our progenitors was, to say the least, a mistake ; and that the only way to realize organic relations and powers in spiritual things, was to return to the Church from which the Puritans came out. Dr. Bushnell, however, thinks that the evil is capable of correction, and applies himself to the work of reform. Nothing is further from his mind than withdrawing from his denomination ; and furthest of all, is the thought of becoming a Churchman. In fact, there is no feature more prominent in his writings, than his

hostility to the Episcopal Church, although, as he once informed the public in the *New Englander*, he received Holy Baptism from one of her Ministers, and is, therefore, warring against the Body of CHRIST, of which he is a member. This hostility appears on every occasion in the form both of sneer and slight. Can, then, a due regard to organic laws and relations, exist and be realized in the Puritan body? We think not—and for the reason that individualism is the very life of Puritanism, and that the present condition of the Puritan community, is but the natural fruit of its original principle.

We say that individualism is the very life principle of Puritanism. Until we get at this, we do not reach the real cause and motive of the Puritan schism. English Puritanism we know was born on the continent, in the bosoms of the exiles during the days of Queen Mary. Now the distinctive feature of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, was the revival of self-consciousness—of the sense of responsibility of the individual will. On the continent, this awakening of the self-conscious energies produced greater excess than in England, by so much as the absolutism of the ecclesiastical power to which it rose in resistance, was more intense and absorbing. The Reformation was there conducted by individuals, in their individual capacity. It was the work of Luther, and Melancthon, and Calvin, and Zuinglius. In England, it was the work of the Bishops, acting in their official capacity as rulers of the Church. It was done through *organic laws* and relations; though the royal authority doubtless contributed largely, as did also the peculiarity of national character, to restrain the tendency to individualism. The course of things on the continent, tended to weaken the hereditary sentiment of organic unity in spiritual relations, and to bring about the rejection of the true organic principle of the Christian Church—Episcopal authority. Luther's doctrine of Justification by Faith only, as at first proclaimed, with only a bare recognition of sacraments and organic relations, had manifestly the effect to depress all sense of the importance of membership in a body, and of course to lead to an undervaluation of every feature of the ecclesiastical constitution, in which the organic relation was involved. Calvin's doctrine of individual predestination, gave a further impulse to this tendency on the part of those who received it; for in this view, the Church was merely a congeries or collection of the predestinated individuals, so far as their predestination was ascertained. Thus, the constitution of the Church became only a polity for the purpose of discipline. Christian

character was irrespective of membership in it, or rather antecedent to membership. The participation of Church privileges was not a means of commencing or continuing union with CHRIST; it was a sign that a man was already by his own act in such union. The ecclesiastical polity varied according to circumstances. The Germans adopted the Presbyterian form of government, with a kind of Superintendent. Calvin devised and enforced an aristocratical form of Presbyterianism. The Englishmen, who had become infected with the principle of individualism, did not scruple to carry it out to its utmost, and Brownism, or Independency was the result. They would have tolerated Episcopacy, if it had not involved submission to the Church. Many of the non-conformists were in favor of *occasional* conformity, if they could thereby hold livings. They were willing to remain in the Church, if only they could have the privilege of exercising their self will, by conducting their worship without the ritual and the clerical garb. And this is the justification of the severities of the time against the non-conformists. The rulers of the Church saw clearly the motive of this plea for only occasional conformity, and that it was impatience of Episcopal control and authority, which would not rest until it abolished Episcopacy.

Individualism was the ruling idea with most of the early settlers of New England, and their whole social, ecclesiastical, and civil life was imbued with it. The men who engaged in the enterprise, were, for the most part, on a social equality. There was no organic constitution, except such as they voluntarily admitted. The ideas of the social contract had their full development. If some persons still retained the impressions, habits, and sentiments which they had acquired in a more organic state of society in England, and even transmitted them to their children for a generation or two, they were not elements of the social constitution, and have in general disappeared before the more legitimate sentiments of individualism; and we have Dr. Bushnell's assertion before us, that this is the pervading character of New England religion, of which he has very strikingly exhibited the features and the results. He refers the birth of this habit of individualism to the days and the writings of Jonathan Edwards. But why should he stop here in tracing its origin? What was it that, as the French philosophers say, produced Edwards, but this very individualism? Edwards was just the philosopher, in whose teaching the individualizing tendency of Puritanism found an advanced development. The "New Light" was only a new phase of an old principle. Unitarianism is an-

other manifestation of the same isolating principle. We think it would be rather hard to find any evidence, that there ever was a better state of religion in New England for any length of time than there is now. We have been accustomed to read much of the low state to which religion had declined, before the great awakening in the days of Edwards and Whitfield, (to which Dr. Bushnell refers on p. 64,) the very period of the "New Light," which he says is now exhibiting its fruits. We have seen an extract from a Sermon of Dr. Bushnell's which, if the passage be fairly quoted, (the Sermon is not at hand, and can not now be obtained,) gives rather a dark picture of the results of the moral and religious training of even the first generation of children in New England. It would seem, therefore, by his own showing, if we may infer like causes from like effects, that from the very first, individualism has been the bane of New England religion. The want of a sense or perception of organic relations, has formed the type of all public religious instruction and means of influence, and its fruit is a religion, devoid of all grace, and beauty, and attractiveness; inconstant, spasmodic, and occasional, and wanting in the dignity of a great and controlling power.

That this is a true solution of the present state of religion prevalent in New England, and wherever New England or Puritan influence reaches, we have no doubt. Its grand deficiency is the absence of a controlling authority and a uniting principle. Want of unity of personal character, grows out of the absence of unity in organic relations. The individuating principle, which is the will, the self-determining faculty, being every thing and subject to no visible control—the disposition and character are not in general, seen to have any relation to the spiritual state, and the affections are not cultivated.*

Now this evil Dr. Bushnell hopes to remedy, by restoring a sense of organic relations in the family. This would be a

* The cause of difference between the practical style of religion of the Orthodox and Unitarian Congregationalists we conceive to be this. The latter being more superficial, and directing attention less to the state of the self-determining faculty, are occupied more with the affections and outward manifestations of a good life; while the Orthodox, directing attention almost exclusively to the will, and making every thing depend upon technical evidence of *conversion*, overlook the cultivation of the affections, as the living exercises of the renewed will, and the conditions of its continuance in a renewed state. The doctrine of the impossibility of falling from grace, has contributed much to the production of this effect. We will not say that the Unitarian error is the least dangerous, but we must say that the effect of the Unitarian habit is much the most agreeable.

step towards amendment, but it would, we suspect, be found inadequate to restore to its efficiency the lost idea of organic life. The family is but a single remove from the individual. There are circumstances which the family relation does not reach. A great many individuals are not included in it. Families too, are multitudinous, almost as much so as individuals, being in proportion on an average of one to five or six. The perception of organic relations, which is to give force to the unity of the family, will need to include a larger sphere. The power which is to make this effective, must descend upon it from a more comprehensive unity, which shall embrace and impregnate this and all other relations. Now every man who believes in Christianity recognizes and attaches some significance to the visible Church, and it may be said that his conception of it controls, and fashions his views of the Christian religion. Tell us what ideas a man has of the Church, and we will tell you what are his views of religion. This is a general rule, though of course, admitting occasional exceptions. And according to this rule, it is, we think impossible, that under the control of Congregationalism, any clear and practical perception of organic relations can be acquired. Congregationalism is, *ex vi termini*, a principle not of unity but of segregation. It declares the independence of every separate local society of Christians, from every and all other societies. There is a kind of brotherhood recognized, but there is no *organic relation* between the several societies, binding them into one body. They have neither actual nor representative unity. They are so many individual societies, consisting each of so many individual persons. Individualism is their very existence, insomuch that it is difficult (as Dr. B. complains) even to convey to a thorough Congregationalist the idea of organic relations. The Catholic Church is, according to the prevalent opinion among them, an inorganic mass of individuals, some of whom are collected in the various discordant religious sects on earth, and some are not collected at all. And this notion is the controlling one, in all the religious conceptions of those who entertain it. When the idea of organic relations and powers enters the mind, so as to become a law or principle of action, faith in Congregationalism is already gone.* The one wholly excludes the other. The desire of unity stops not at the family; it looks to a higher

* We express what we believe to be the general fact, as derived not only from the very nature of the case, but from observation; there may be, as in the case of our author, exceptions, owing to peculiar causes.

unity which shall be inclusive of all unities. It repels the notion of the Church as an inorganic mass, a confused heap of societies, bound together by no visible organic power and bond, and looks for some tangible principle which may satisfy the cravings of the mind for unity. It prepares the mind to receive and be affected by the arguments for a Divine constitution of the Church, which shall preserve it from destruction, and distinguish it from all counterfeits. By nothing but an arbitrary dogmatism, can such a germ of thought stop short of Faith in the One Catholic and Apostolic Church. Evangelical alliances will not satisfy its demands, for they are not *unity*, but union, and that imperfect at the best, and without any organic relations.

Now it is idle to talk about organic relations to the Church, when the Church is not recognized as a visibly organized body. When we speak of organic relations, we speak not of mere intellectual entities, or of purely spiritual conceptions. We refer to actual relations, which are recognizable in time and space, and testified to us by sensible tokens; and to say that we have organic relations to that which has no corporate existence, is simply absurd. The Church either is an organized body or it is not. If it is not, then it can not satisfy the instinctive desire of the spiritually enlightened mind, which has the idea of organic relations for unity. If it is, then our membership in it is constituted by some visible authoritative act; the performance of such an act implies an *authority* given by, and received from its Divine Head. This leads to the Scriptures and Ancient History for the purpose of ascertaining what that authority is, and the result of such studies under the influence of such a sentiment, is almost always identical.

Notwithstanding, however, this repugnancy between Congregationalism and the idea of organic or corporate relations, we can not but hope that this present work will be effective, for awaking that idea in many thoughtful minds, and we therefore rejoice in its production, as a movement in the line of truth. It must break up mechanical and contracted habits of thought. It must destroy the confidence of many, in their notions of revivals, and technical conversions and experiences. It can but open the eyes of our neighbors, we should think, to their actual religious condition, and satisfy them, that they have not a monopoly of goodness. This would be a step towards improvement.

But a question arises in this connection, which in conclusion we can not forbear suggesting. Supposing that this idea of organic relations was awakened, has it in itself the power of a

new life, so as to impregnate the Congregational Communion, and restore to it vigor and energy? Is there *in the body*, (such a body as it is,) an inherent vitality, which only needs to be acted on, by the revival of some forgotten or obscured truth, to bring it forth? Is there in *the system*, the supernatural element, by which alone, in the view of all who profess attachment to the ancient faith, the corruption of human nature can be counteracted? These are questions which throw open the whole field of controversy respecting the notes of the Church and the Divine presence within it, and which we can not now, of course, enter upon. We simply make the suggestion for the consideration of those, in whom new trains of thought may have been started by Dr. Bushnell, and in the hope that having taken up the line of truth, they will follow wherever it may lead.

DR. HAMPDEN, AND CHURCH AND STATE.

ART. VI.—1. *A Concise History of the Hampden Controversy, &c. &c. With all the Documents, &c.* By the Rev. HENRY CHRISTMAS, M. A., London, 1848.

2. *The Christian Remembrancer, for January, 1848.*

3. *Remains of the Rev. RICHARD HURRELL FROUDE, M. A.* Late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. Part the Second. Derby, 1839.

THE name of Renn Dickson Hampden, D. D., has, for the last twelve years, been more or less associated with the current of controversy in the English Church; and that very circumstance is enough to invest it with interest in our view. It was in the year 1836, during the Premiership of Viscount Melbourne, that he became Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, in the place of the lamented Burton. Since that event, in one way and another, in connection with one and another question, he has, at brief intervals of time, been brought out to public view, in a way, which, to say the least, has given him considerable notoriety. At no time, however, has he been so prominently brought forward as since December, 1847. And never has his name been connected with questions of more stirring interest, or involving matters of more pressing moment, than those, which the discussions and examinations, consequent on his nomination to the See of Hereford, have evoked. With the question concerning Dr. Hampden's Theology we have here no concern. We have, indeed, a very distinct opinion as to its direct bearings and necessary issues; an opinion, moreover, not taken up at random, but formed by a perusal of his Lectures. Our object is not, however, here to express it. We propose, after a brief historical retrospect, accompanied by some remarks and explanations, to pass to the consideration of that momentous question, which a few words, written at the dictation of a statesman, have flung in all its length and breadth before the members of the English Church. Such a strange and even awful prerogative is that which Almighty God has granted to the words of rulers and their ministers!

And here we must repeat what we have just said, that we are not at all concerned with the question whether Dr. Hampden's views are actually sound or unsound. In this introductory sketch we are merely, so far as our remarks relate to Dr. Hampden personally, occupied with the principles on which, and the modes by which, he has at various times been

judged and condemned. And if it shall appear, that the principles and modes of judgment to which he objects in his own case, have either been directly acted upon, or tacitly acquiesced in by him, when others were concerned, then be his Theology what it may, Dr. Hampden himself must stand convicted of gross inconsistency, to use no severer term. For surely, the principles of justice do not thus change at the instance of individuals. The conduct of the judge, in the homely old story of the farmer's cow that had been gored, is not the model for an upright man. Nor are we aware of any thing in the *personnel* of Dr. Hampden so peculiar, as to exempt him from the operation of rules to which he has no scruple to subject others. If, moreover, other names shall occur in the progress of these remarks, we desire also to be understood as no more expressing any opinion as to the systems with which they are connected, than we do in Dr. Hampden's case. In short, it is neither the doctrine of Dr. Hampden's *Lectures*, nor of Dr. Pusey's *Sermon*, nor of Mr. Ward's *Ideal*, that we have in view ; but simply the mode in which each has been dealt with. We prefer on this point to incur the charge of needless prolixity, rather than even the slightest risk of being misunderstood.

We go back then to the date of Dr. Hampden's Bampton Lectures. These remarkable productions were delivered and published in 1832 : being, as circumstances have all along gone to show, the fruits of their author's acquaintance with Mr. Blanco White, whose unhappy career is but too well known. No official notice, however, was taken of them till 1836, when, on occasion of the appointment of their author to the Regius Chair of Divinity, they, together with his "Observations on Dissent," published in 1834, were made the grounds of the celebrated Statute, by which he was deprived of her offices, which up to that time had always appertained to his Professorship.

And here we are at once met by a difficulty. Why were not these productions, if censurable, sooner visited with censure ? Why were four years suffered to elapse between the publication of the first censurable work and the action of the University ? Lord John Russell alluded to this difficulty in his reply to the protest of the thirteen Bishops, and the Bishop of Exeter disposed of it as follows : " During those four years Dr. Hampden was in no position specially and immediately connected with Theological teaching : his errors, therefore, however grave, were not so formidable as to demand the unusual interposition of the University, as a body, to vin-

dicating the sacred truths which he had impugned.* We use these words so far as they account for the action of the University, and not here taking into consideration, the judgment pronounced in them on Dr. Hampden's views. It has been replied, indeed, to this statement of Bishop Philpotts, that in 1833, Lord Grenville, the then Chancellor, appointed the author of the Bampton Lectures, Principal of St. Mary Hall; and that in 1834—whether before or after the publication of the "Observations on Dissent," we can not say,—the Vice Chancellor, Dr. Rowley, and the Heads of Christ Church, Magdalene, and St. John's, namely, Drs. Gaisford, Routh and Wynter,† elected him to the White Professorship of Moral Philosophy; while in neither case did the University interfere. But these facts tell a great deal more on paper, and especially on this side the Atlantic, than they do or should in reality. For the mere Headship of a Hall places its possessor in no more especial Theological attitude to the University at large, than a Fellowship in a College. Beside which fact, it is to be remembered, that the Colleges are independent bodies, and in certain respects the Halls also; ‡ and therefore, that if the immediate members of St. Mary Hall raised no objection to Lord Grenville's appointment, it would have been singularly out of place for the University, as such, to have interfered. In regard to the White Professorship, it is true that the electors named above were bound by the statute to select a person *religionis sinceritate commendatus*. But surely this provision looks far more to life than to doctrine. Neither do the duties of that Professorship, if we are rightly informed, have an especial relation to Doctrinal Instruction. All that can be made of the appointment, is more than counterbalanced by the very significant fact, that when Dr. Hampden vacated the Chair in 1836, it was given to Mr. Sewell, one of the permanent committee appointed to manage the opposition to the new Regius Professor. If this fact proves nothing more, it at least proves that nothing can be made of the appointment to the White Professorship either way. To this may be added some statements of Mr. Palmer in his "Narrative," which show that a protest, or something of the kind, was

* We might add, that Dr. Hampden's Lectures were carefully reviewed in the *British Critic* for July, 1833, which might be considered as a reason for omitting all other action.

† The two Proctors for the time being, are also Electors in this case.

‡ The only respect in which the Halls are not independent, we believe to be this: that not being incorporated, the University holds their estates in trust. But this plainly does not teach the present argument.

talked of after the publication of the "Observations on Dissent," but that the idea was discouraged, because, unless it became absolutely necessary on other grounds, such a course would only call attention to what would probably otherwise be but little noticed. We can not see, therefore, but that the statement of the Bishop of Exeter remains untouched, that from 1832 to 1836, Dr. Hampden "was in no position specially connected with Theological teaching"—while this fact abundantly explains the four years' silence of the University.

At length, however, the time came when Dr. Hampden was to be directly and specially connected with Theological teaching, and when the responsibility also of the University became especial and direct. Dr. Burton died early in 1836, and "in a few days," says Mr. Palmer, "we were electrified by the intelligence that Dr. Hampden was to be appointed to the vacant chair." The throne was petitioned, and the petition was rejected, less probably at the King's own will, than that of his Ministers. The Heads of Houses were addressed again and again, and they at last consented that a censure on Dr. Hampden should be brought forward in Convocation. This censure took the form of the Statute above referred to, and was passed by a vote of 474 to 94.

From these facts, we turn to a correspondence which took place between the Regius Professor and the Archbishop of Canterbury in the years 1836 and 1838. And we do this, because we are thus enabled to gather, from his own words, Dr. Hampden's objections against the course of the University. We shall be able to derive from it, unless we are greatly mistaken, a very sufficient commentary on the whole matter. The correspondence, so far as published, consists of seven letters; those written by the Professor contrasting most unfavorably, both in tone and temper, with those of the late lamented and amiable Primate. Indeed we must say, that every where there is something very hard, uncomfortable, and forbidding about Dr. Hampden; something very like that "atmosphere of repulsion," which in his view invests the Creeds and Articles.

The first objection to which the correspondence introduces us, is, that the *Bampton Lectures* and the *Observations on Dissent*, have both been misunderstood. That in neither, did the author intend to say what people had thought he did. Now plainly, however much this fact may tend to clear Dr. Hampden personally, it is a most fallacious ground on which to object to the action of the University. Accordingly, the Archbishop in 1836, declares that he does not at all doubt Dr.

Hampden's assertion that he did not intend to teach any thing erroneous, and then adds : " but the question turns, in my apprehension, not so much on your views and intentions of which you are the proper judge, but on the impression which certain parts of your writings are calculated to make, and actually have made, in the minds of common readers, as well as of persons well versed in Theology." And once more, in 1838, when Dr. Hampden had again urged the same plea, the Archbishop replies, that he does not doubt the goodness of Dr. Hampden's intentions, but still reminds him, " that the principal objection still remains, that if, on the great topics on which he is to instruct students in divinity, a man can so write, as that both common and learned readers mistake him, he is not a safe teacher." These lucid statements of Dr. Howley, seem to us to present the case in precisely its true light.

The mere statement, in general terms, that one has no intention of teaching error, can of course amount to nothing. Because in the majority of cases, the very difficulty is, that the person so teaching, himself mistakes error for truth ; and is perhaps in more need of enlightenment than either his hearers or readers. Any such general assertion, therefore, however sounding it may be, is really good for nothing. But Dr. Hampden in this case goes further. Specific errors are charged against his teaching ; common readers and Theologians have found them as they thought in his published works. He denies, however, that he intended to teach them. Very well. Dr. Hampden personally is cleared from evil intention. But what possible bearing does, or can this have, on the question of his fitness to occupy a position, when Theological teaching is his main and express duty ? And where, not integrity of intention alone, but capacity for instruction also, comes into the account ? We are surprised—or rather in any other case we should be—at any stress being laid, under the circumstances, upon such a plea. In short, there was, it seems to us, a very plain dilemma in this matter. Either Dr. Hampden did consider the errors charged against him grave errors, or he did not. If he did not, then it was disingenuous to leave the impression that he did, by denying in the way in which he did deny, that he intended to teach them. If he did so consider them, then surely the feeling, that what he thought so plain, had so misled others, and these not mere hearers, but readers, and thoughtful readers also, would, we should suppose, have made him somewhat to distrust his capacity as a teacher.

But it clearly appears, alike from this correspondence and

every thing else which Dr. Hampden has written upon the subject, that his regrets at being misunderstood, relate far more to his own interests, than to those of truth. It is not so much the thought of how many he may have led into even deadly error, and that in relation to the most awful mysteries of our Holy Faith, that weighs upon his mind, as the reflection that he has been so unfortunate as to subject himself to suspicion and discredit, and thus to bar the progress of "a rising man," as Blanco White called him, when he alleged this as a reason why he could not afford in his *Bampton Lectures* to carry out his principles to their legitimate conclusion. And this is a temper of mind, which it is more easy than pleasant, to characterize.

Dr. Hampden's second objection to the proceedings of 1836,—and we pause upon these objections the rather here, because they are in the main the same which he advances in 1847,—is, that they were the work of a cabal. The proof of this we do not find. He no doubt found it in the mere fact that he had been censured; other persons, however, may be pardoned for asking for more proof. But where shall it be found? In the vote of 474 to 94? That looks precisely the other way. In the way in which the opposition was managed? Every thing was open to the light of day. In the personal characters of his opponents? They forbid the supposition. In the fact that men of all parties,—excepting, of course, Dr. Hampden's own,—joined in it? That fact must be explained away, before the idea can be even hinted at. And Dr. Arnold attempted to explain it, at least so far as one set of persons was concerned. He says; "I think that the Evangelicals have, in some instances, been led to join in the clamor against him from their foolish fondness for their particular phraseology, and from their want of ability to recognize the real features of any movement of opinion." But this is very disrespectful, and we are fain to think unjust besides. Not half so disrespectful or unjust, indeed, as many other sayings of Dr. Arnold about the same persons,—who, singularly enough, seem now to regard him as quite one of themselves,—but still, both disrespectful and unjust. Their testimony is not in this instance to be so disposed of.

The truth is, that this idea of a cabal, is always ready enough to occur to people when they get into trouble; and especially to people whose mental idiosyncracies are such as Dr. Hampden's. In his view, it is all along a personal thing to himself. By a singular, but easily analyzed mental process, he simplifies the whole thing to that one aspect. He,

Dr. Hampden, looms in such towering majesty, that he fills the field of vision ; and Professors' chairs and Bishop's thrones are mere appendages to this concrete me. No assurances of his own personally unimportant position, no declaration that it is his principles and not himself that are had in view, can correct this hallucination. He entrenches himself within the circle of petty, personal, and selfish considerations, as it were, within a magic ring. In vain do we seek for some break in the charmed line, through which we may assure him, that with true and generous minds, abstract principles displace the concrete me. None such can be found. All within, is Dr. Hampden, all without, cabal !

By far the most imposing allegation, however, against the opposition of 1836, is, that it was schismatical. The way in which it is attempted to show this, is sufficiently remarkable, partaking, as it does, of that peculiar haziness of statement for which Dr. Hampden is so notorious. He first argues, in a very summary way, that because St. Paul condemns those who make divisions, therefore his opponents are schismatical. But before this argument can be applied, surely it must be settled whereabouts the *onus* of beginning the making of divisions lies. And in this case, it plainly lies with him who published matter, supposed, at least, to be justly obnoxious to censure. Otherwise, the argument proves too much, since any utterer of strange doctrine, Arius, for instance, might shelter himself under it. Indeed, Mr. Newman could have advanced the same plea against those who moved in the matter of Tract No. 90, and Mr. Ward against the impugnors of his "Ideal." Dr. Hampden's logic can not claim to reason by special license,—*a dicto secundum quid, ad dictum simpliciter*. But again he argues, that the Ordination vow virtually condemns those who moved against his works. True it is, that by that vow the Clergy are bound to "drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines." But, says Dr. Hampden, the following sentence expressly limits this duty to each man's especial cure. But this is quibbling. For the very next words to those which we have quoted, are, "*from the Church ;*" and this settles the question. Beside, we are not aware that Dr. Hampden has confined his movements against error, either to the Rectory of Ewelme, or the precincts of St. Mary Hall. And last of all he declares, that he ought in the first instance to have been delated to his Bishop, and no further proceedings instituted against him but with Episcopal sanction. Now really, all this sudden exhibition of canonical strictness and staunch Churchmanship, is

simply idle. It reminds us of the great deference for the letter of the law, which law-breakers often profess, on their trials; and since "to be grave, exceeds all power of face," we must be excused for laughing. Dr. Hampden's objection, however, here grows out of the fact, that he can not see beyond himself in this whole matter. It is presumed that the University of Oxford, may, without at all infringing upon the rights of Episcopacy, determine whether certain publications do, or do not, disqualify their author from the discharge of certain academic duties, to which an external power has advanced him. Dr. Hampden personally, was not put on trial for heresy before the University; this would have been to interfere with the Episcopal prerogative and the Arches Court. But his fitness for discharging certain academic duties was questioned; and this was a matter evidently within the jurisdiction of the University.

But how comes it, that his voice, so eloquent in its own behalf in 1838, is so mute and silent in 1843, when Dr. Pusey was brought under the judgment of the six Doctors, and in 1845, when Mr. Ward was brought before Convocation? We are not pronouncing any opinion on either of the works which on these occasions came into consideration; nor on the actual judgment that was given. That is beyond our purpose here. We are only concerned with the principles of justice. And we say, that every argument which Dr. Hampden urged to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1838, applies just as strongly in their case as in his. And why then did he not keep the ground in regard to them, which he assumed for himself? Why did he commit himself in principle to the very course, against which, in his own case, he reclaimed with earnest indignation? The reason is too obvious to need stating.

A space of six years carries us on from 1836 to 1842, and to the Vice Chancellorship at Oxford, of Dr. Wynter. In this year it was, that the attempt was made to abrogate the statute passed against Dr. Hampden in 1836. The time selected for the attempt was on all accounts a most favorable one. The continual clamor which Dr. Hampden and his friends had kept up about a cabal, had, no doubt, produced considerable effect; but it was small, compared with that which had arisen from other circumstances. Mr. Gladstone has ably pointed out two points of remarkable change, in the Church movement begun in 1833, and which, in spite of individual follies and extravagances, has produced, and is producing the most wonderful results; especially so, in awak-

ening, what we believe to have been far more needed there than even here, a juster appreciation of the nature and prerogatives, of the Church of CHRIST,—prerogatives, not the gift of the State, and by no just right subject to her control. The publication of Mr. Froude's *Remains*, denotes the commencement of this double change. Its first form was the disrespectful and unjust mode in which the Anglican Reformers, and especially the great Jewel, were spoken of. Its second, was the assumption that the existing Church of Rome was not only to be treated with that respect which was denied to the Church of England, but was on the whole the best living model of a Christian Church. And thus there was exhibited the strange spectacle, of extreme tenderness to an "erring sister," and harsh contempt for a not faultless mother! We do not mean of course to say, that the great body of those who shared in and sympathized with the Church movement begun in 1833, had any part in, or any sympathy with this twofold change. Still in such cases, extreme views, and far pushed notions, are what always come mostly under the popular eye, and furnish the popular mind with the grounds of its judgment. And hence the position of one leader, and of a comparatively few young followers, absorbed the general gaze, and caused a suspicion to rest upon the whole movement, and upon all persons connected with it. All this was, no doubt, unjust; but few persons, who have attended to the every day progress of their own lives, will say that it was unnatural. And this,—remembering that Dr. Hampden had artfully connected his theological position with that of opposition to these extravagances, a connection which was in no sense real, but the merest accident,—quite sufficiently accounts for the alteration in numbers, when, on the 7th of June, 1842, the proposed abrogation of the censure was negatived by a vote of 334 to 219.

It must, however, be stated in addition, that it was strongly doubted at the time, whether the majority were really so small as the above numbers would indicate. It is not intended, of course, to intimate that there was any designed unfairness in the arrangements on that occasion. Such a charge would be preposterous. Nor is it possible to explain to persons unacquainted with Oxford localities, the precise position of things which probably occasioned the great over-estimate of the *placets*. Suffice it to say, that two distinct and separate estimations of the *placets*, before they came to be mixed up with the *non-placets*, reckoned them only at 150. The coincidence is at least remarkable, and taken in connection

with other circumstances, renders it probable that the *placets* were much over-estimated in the actual counting, which was by the arrangements a most confused and uncertain process.

Passing now over Mr. McMullen's case, on which we have no space to dwell, and which, indeed, is rather an episode to our retrospect, we come, in 1845, to the proposed action of the University of Oxford, in relation to the subscription of the Thirty-Nine Articles. And here we must pause to notice certain extraordinary facts. In the year 1834, and we desire our readers to take especial notice of these facts and dates, the same year in which Dr. Hampden published his *Observations on Religious Dissent*, being now one of the Heads of Houses, a proposition emanated from those Heads, and came before Convocation in the following year, *to abolish the signature of the Articles of Matriculation*. It was felt to be, and undoubtedly it was, the legitimate result of the *Bampton Lectures*, the *Observations on Dissent*, and the influence of Dr. Hampden in the Hebdomadal Board. Dr. Arnold always considered Dr. Hampden's views on the matter of Subscription as identical with his own, and what those were, it is certainly unnecessary to state; while Dr. Hampden had said: "I do not scruple to avow myself favorable to the removal of all tests, so far as they are employed as securities of orthodoxy among our members at large." We can not be mistaken, then, in referring the proposed abrogation of Subscription to the influence of Dr. Hampden and his fellow-thinkers. The proposition, however, was negatived in Convocation, by a vote of 459 to 57.

In striking contrast with this proposition, we find the Hebdomadal Board, consisting mainly of the same persons of which it was composed in 1835, proposing, in 1845, a new and more stringent form of subscription to the Articles, going altogether beyond all previous proposed forms, and binding the conscience of the individual by the current exposition of the University for the time being. And to this proposition Dr. Hampden consented! The purpose failed, indeed, but not for want of his good will. And the only possible view, in which his conduct can appear consistent, is suggested by the fact, that the same persons would probably have been more or less annoyed by the two plans of 1835, and 1845. Dr. Arnold we are sure would have been too high-minded for such a course. Whether Dr. Hampden has been or not, we leave to our readers to decide.

And now we come to the *denouement* of the Professor's course, and to the great questions which the recent action in

relation to the See of Hereford involves. The *congé d'élire* to the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of Hereford, bears date Dec. 11th, 1847, and appeared in the London Gazette of the 14th of the same month. And here, leaving for a time our direct narrative, we must pass to what may be considered a digression, but is really very germane to the matter in hand, to some considerations, that is, on Church and State. For we have suddenly lighted on that ominous word, which opens up the whole great question. And we find here, as in many other cases, Dr. Hampden discharging an office, analogous to that of a decent waiter in household economy; and very unconsciously bringing forward, rather by the contrivance of others, or by the force of circumstances, than by his own volition, important matters for discussion. To Church and State then, for a time, we must turn. Yet not, it should be observed, to the general question; only to that particular form of relationship, under which these two bodies appear in England; to its history in time past, to its actual condition at present.

A writer, who, whatever may be thought of many of his writings, has at least treated this subject very ably, and of whose assistance we propose considerably to avail ourselves,—remarks very justly, that the present relations of Church and State in England, may be classed under two heads: State Protection, and State Interference. It is with the latter of these, that we are chiefly concerned; but it will not be amiss to say something of the former, especially as the most exaggerated ideas of its nature and extent prevail amongst us. What then, we ask, is actually the amount of protection and aid which the State affords to the Church in England? It consists chiefly of four things, and these shall be stated in the words of the writer to whom we have referred above.

The first is, “in securing to the Church by Law, some small portion of those ample endowments which the piety of our forefathers set apart for the maintenance of true religion. Of these endowments, far more than half are at this day in the hands of noble aristocrats, who may be of any religion or none, and do not consider themselves obliged to spend a farthing of it in the cause of God.* But there is a certain remnant of it in the hands of the clergy, who are thereby enabled to live without being a burden to the poor people. It further consists, in enabling the Church to raise a tax on real property, for the

* A notable example of this, is found in the family of the Premier Lord John Russell. They have lived for three centuries on Church spoils.

keeping parish Churches in tolerable and decent repair through the country, which tax, as estimated by those who put it at the highest, amounts to as many thousands a year as the other taxes amount to hundred thousands. It consists further, in allowing thirty Bishops to sit and vote in the House of Lords. "And it is found lastly," in the writ *de excommunicato capiendo*, by which the State engages, that on receiving due notice of the excommunication of any given person, he shall be arrested and put in prison, till he is absolved. Such," he continues, "are the four principal heads of State Protection: on reading them over, it will occur to every one, that the first is no more than common justice, and no greater favor than every other person in the country receives in being protected from thieves; that as to the second, the most one can infer from it, is, that in the eye of the state, the importance of the Church is to the importance of the civil government as one to a hundred: that to counterbalance the third, which admits seven Bishops to the House of Lords, all clergymen are excluded from the House of Commons; and that the fourth is a bad useless law, which can not be done away with too soon." So much for State Protection.

In passing now to speak of State interference, we find that the subject naturally divides itself into the persons who interfere, and the modes in which the interference is made. We must first consider the persons; and these are, the Parliament, and the Crown, each of which demands to be treated of separately.

There is only one principle on which the interference of Parliament in matters of ecclesiastical legislation, can be either justified or defended; and that is the one stated by Hooker in the Eighth Book of his Ecclesiastical Polity, which may be shortly expressed, as the consent of all orders, to laws which are to govern all. In the case of the English laws ecclesiastical, such a consent was to be obtained by the concurrent action of Convocation, in which the clergy were represented, and of Parliament, which represented the Laity. The character, then, which according to this view, and it rests certainly on the highest authority, entitled Parliament to share in Ecclesiastical legislation, was, that it was the Lay Synod of the Church of England; Convocation being the Clerical Synod; and laws ecclesiastical, when passed by the concurrent action of these two bodies, and ratified by the Crown, having received the sanction of all orders of persons in the realm.

Now it is obvious, that this method of Legislation continued to be just to the Church—and we are considering it at present

only in relation to her—so long as Parliament was really a Lay Synod of the Church, and no longer. Whenever it ceased to sustain that character, then of course its right to perform an act which depended on that character, ought in all justice to have also ceased. To determine when that change of character occurred, it is necessary to glance briefly at certain parts of English Legislation. When Hooker wrote, and his statement is confirmed by an Act of Parliament passed in the 35th of Elizabeth, 1592, the same persons identically, in the eye of the law, composed the Church of England, and the English nation. Accordingly, therefore, as this body was viewed under its spiritual or its political aspect, so the one or the other of these names was applied to it. At one time it might be called the Church, and at another time the Nation, but still in law it was identically the same body. "We hold," says Hooker,* "that there is not a man of the Church of England, but the same man is also a member of the Commonwealth; nor any member of the Commonwealth, which is not also of the Church of England." And this is in perfect accordance with the statute above noted, which under strict and severe penalties compelled all persons to conform to, and become members of the Church of England, or else to quit the Kingdom. We are not defending this statute. We feel as strongly as any one can its atrocity and injustice. But we refer to it merely as establishing the fact which we have asserted; the identity, namely, in the eye of the law, of the Church, and the Commonwealth, and the character of Parliament, as the Lay Synod of the former.

This statute continued in force by various successive enactments until 1688, when the Act of Toleration was passed in the first year of William and Mary. From that period, the Commonwealth ceased to be identical with the Church, though, as we shall see, Parliament did not entirely lose its character as a Lay Synod. The conditions on which Church Legislation had been permitted to it, were affected indeed, but still they were not cancelled. Let it not be supposed that we are objecting to the Act of Toleration. Far from it. All we say is, that so far as the conditions were concerned, on which Parliament claimed to legislate for the Church, they were affected by it: and a provision ought to have been made in view of the change, which was not.

Still, there were three other acts founded on the same principle which remained in force, and therefore, as we have said,

* Eccl. Pol. viii: 1. 2.

the conditions on which alone Parliament could claim to legislate in matters ecclesiastical, were not entirely cancelled. By two of these acts, the government of all corporations, and the possession of every office held directly or indirectly by gift of the Crown, were restricted to communicants of the Church of England, while by the third, all Roman Catholics were excluded from a seat in Parliament. In 1828, however, the Test and Corporation Acts, as they are called, were repealed. In 1829, Roman Catholics were admitted to a seat in Parliament. And in 1832, the Reform Act finally overthrew the whole ancient system, and the condition on which Parliament claimed ecclesiastical legislation, as the Lay Synod of the Church, was completely and utterly cancelled. For in what possible sense, since 1832, can the Imperial Parliament be termed a Lay Synod of the Church of England?

We shall be grievously *misunderstood*, however, if we shall be understood as opposing or objecting to, the progress of popular liberty, which this course of legislation witnesses to and provides for. We have certainly no such feeling. But we do say distinctly, and we fear not to challenge the assent of any man's common sense, that to continue to Parliament a power, the exercise of which depends on a character which Parliament no longer possesses, is an act, the absurdity of which is only surpassed by its injustice. It is very true that the identity of the Church and the Commonwealth is at best but a legal fiction, and that legislation founded on legal fictions is always evil. It is true, moreover, that this may afford very good ground for deciding, that Parliament ought never to have been made a Lay Synod of the English Church, and so allowed to interfere in matters ecclesiastical. It is true, that the Act of Toleration was just and good in all points of view, except that while it justly changed the relations between Parliament and the Church, it unjustly left in the hands of Parliament, precisely the same powers in ecclesiastical legislation which it had before. While to this continuous and unjust usurpation of powers, there is added the grossest of all absurdities, when every vestige of its character as a Lay Synod of the Church having been destroyed, Parliament still gravely continues to legislate in that character. In a word, in the course of legislation, which we have reviewed, the rights of all persons have been consulted, save only the rights of the Church. We repeat it, we do not object to the legislation itself; what we do fault, is, that we can find no provision made for curtailing powers, committed to Parliament as sustaining a given character, which character, in the lapse of centuries has utterly disappeared.

And this injustice is still farther increased by the fact, that since the Lower House of Convocation in 1717, made bold to condemn the heretical tenets of Hoadley,* and so fell under the Royal displeasure, and were summarily prorogued, that body has never been allowed to hold more than *pro forma* sittings. So that actually, during the very period when Parliament has been becoming less and less entitled to be considered the representative of the Laity of the English Church, all ecclesiastical legislation has been committed to its hands, and no clergyman has had any voice in settling those laws by which he is to be governed, except so far as he could speak by the Bishops in the Upper House, who, in by far the majority of cases, have exhibited *un grand talent pour le silence*. It really only needed this, to put the cope stone to this mass of absurdities.

In turning now to consider the interference of the Crown in matters ecclesiastical, we do not intend to enter upon the tedious historical view of the mode in which it came to be established. It is enough to observe, that the position out of which has grown its present form in England, was accepted by the Church as a refuge from the Papal usurpations. The results of the acceptance, remind one strongly of the old fable of the stag, the horse and the man. However, let the Crown have been never so much entitled to interfere, and let its interference have been never so safe before 1832, it has not been so since. On the 17th of May, in that year, the Duke of Wellington pronounced in the House of Lords, the Funeral Oration, as Mr. Disraeli calls it, over the old Constitution of England. It was then most distinctly declared, that the King could not stand out against the House of Commons if they chose to remain firm: nay, that by Earl Grey's own showing, the Coronation Oath itself must give way before them! Now all this may be well in itself; whether it is or not, we do not care to inquire, for we are only concerned with the fact. But since Parliament is no longer composed of members of the Church, and may very probably, nay, we may say, certainly will be, in part made up of her enemies, is it either just or safe, to entrust such powers of interference with the Church as the Crown now possesses, to a person so completely under the

* Even at the risk of anticipating, we can not forbear to notice the practical operation of the *congé d'élire*. In 1723, the Chapter of Salisbury, elected Hoadley Bishop. In 1734, Hoadley having been translated to Winchester, the same body elected Sherlock Bishop, who was Prolocuter of the Convocation that condemned Hoadley!

control of Parliament, as the events of May, 1832, and of all subsequent years, prove the Sovereign of England to be.

It appears, then, that the character of both the Sovereign and the Parliament has changed, and with it their relations to the English Church, since they were entrusted severally with the right of interfering in Church affairs. These changes are exceedingly consonant with our ideas of right in this country. But would it not be as consonant with every principle of justice, that powers committed to them under their former character and relations, should cease to be theirs when that character and those relations have totally disappeared? We can not doubt, that every honest, true-hearted man will say yes, to this plain question. On this side the Atlantic at least, where personal and party considerations can not come in, to the same extent as in England, we feel sure that there can be but one opinion.

We have spoken of the persons interfering. It remains to speak of the modes in which the interference is made, and these may be classed under the two heads of Patronage and Discipline. A single instance shall be adduced under these heads severally, which will set the subject in a clearer light than almost any amount of discussion.

Under the head of Patronage, no instance more important presents itself than the process, which, by a legal fiction,—and legal fictions do actually seem to be many an Englishman's daily breath,—is called by the solemn name of an Episcopal Election. Precisely what that process was, remained to most persons an unexplained mystery, until recent events removed the dusty veils, where ancient and imposing folds were supposed to cover some august ceremonial, and revealed that to which it is exceedingly difficult to affix a proper appellation. We must therefore content ourselves with presenting the thing, and leave our readers to name it for themselves.

Some of the details will perhaps be familiar to many; but we trust that on the whole we shall not be merely stating what every body knows already.

The Act under which the Bishops of the Church of England are at present appointed, is the 25th of Henry VIII, passed in 1533. It allots the several parts of the matter of election, of all that is, which precedes consecration, as follows: to the Sovereign it gives nomination; to the Clergy of the Cathedral Church, election; and to the Archbishop of the Province, Consecration. All the rights of election which the laity exercised in the Primitive Church, and which among us they happily still enjoy, are by this statute gathered together,

and by a legal fiction centered in the person of the Sovereign. All those rights of election, which are the property of the Clergy of the Diocese, are also gathered together, and by another legal fiction, centered in the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church. The Archbishop alone is permitted to stand for himself! By this very apportionment, then, and on its very face, this Act bears the plain and distinct character of a sham. The Laity of the Diocese are ordered off the stage, and in their place the Sovereign appears. The Clergy of the Diocese share the same fate, and in their place appear, as their representatives, a Dean and some Prebendaries and Canons, whom they have not elected. The Archbishop remains, indeed, somewhat surprised, as we may fancy, at the legal jugglery by which some hundred thousand laity have been converted into a Sovereign with a Prime Minister at his back, and some hundreds of Clergy have been changed into a Dean and a few Prebendaries; to what purpose he remains, we shall see by and by.

Now if this were all, it would certainly be bad enough. But it is not all. Much more remains behind. The train of legal fictions winds on, like the unfolding coils of some huge serpent seen in dreams. According to what has hitherto been stated, the Sovereign nominates, the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church elect, and the Archbishop confirms. But by other provisions of the same Act, to which we have already referred, the two processes of election and confirmation may be utterly superseded by the Royal Presentation. For the provision is as follows. On the avoidance of a Bishopric, whether by death or translation, the *congé d'élire*, or permission to elect, is sent from the Crown to the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church, accompanied with a letter missive, in which is given the name of the person nominated to the See. If within twenty days the Dean and Chapter do not elect the person so nominated, they become liable to the pains and penalties of the Statutes of *Provision* and *Præmunire*; that is, to forfeiture of goods, imprisonment, fine, and outlawry. And if within the same period the Archbishop does not confirm the person nominated by the Sovereign, and elected by the Dean and Chapter, he also becomes liable to the same pains and penalties. While in case these pains and penalties prove insufficient, the presentation of the Sovereign supersedes both election and confirmation, and thus practically nullifies them both. The Sovereign, then, really holds in his hands, however much a mass of words may have concealed the fact, the rights of the Bishops, Clergy and laity of England, in the matter of an Episcopal Election.

But here we have a word to say to those who will, upon the statement of all this, triumphantly declare, that the Church of England is the mere creature of the State, and that those whom we call the successors of the Apostles, are, after all, but the nominees of the secular authority. To this we reply, first, that the Church of England is, indeed, held in bondage by the State, but that that alone can not make her its creature. For complete subserviency to the State, for creatureship and sycophancy, we must rather look to the Protestant bodies of the continent, than to the English Church. And as to the second allegation, we beg that it may be remembered, that nomination, election, and confirmation, are all previous human processes, conducive as it has been supposed to the well-administration of things ecclesiastical; and that over and above them, there still remains another step, not of human, but of divine institution, that of CONSECRATION. To this step, indeed, the State has endeavored to coerce the Archbishops by the same sworn penalties of *Provision* and *Præmunire*. But she has not, as in the case of election and confirmation, dared to supersede it, if refused, by any human provision. The difference is noticeable and meaning. The hand of Uzzah has touched the Ark, but it has not been laid upon the priestly head. In the case of election and confirmation, the State has denounced penalties and provided alternatives. In that of Consecration, she has denounced penalties, but she has ventured on no more. She has bound, so far as man could bind, the Apostolic hands. But, thank God, she has not dared to substitute others in their place. The laying on of hands remains inviolate.

In regard to the second division of State Interference, which, it will be remembered, related to Church Discipline, it may suffice to instance the Statute of limitations, as we shall venture to call it, by which it is forbidden to proceed against Clergymen for errors in religion, or viciousness of life, provided the charges brought, or the errors alleged, are of more than two years standing! The miserable results of such a Statute were forcibly illustrated some time ago, in the fact that the Bishop of Peterborough could not proceed against one of his Clergy, who, by his own confession, had been guilty of the grossest acts of licentiousness. And they are illustrated now by the fact, that Dr. Hampden has evaded a trial for heresies alleged to be contained in his "Observations on Dissent," by a skillful use of this same Statute; which, be it observed, was the work of the very persons who chiefly sneer at the English Church for her want of that discipline, which

they themselves, by the law of the land, have forbidden her to exercise.

So much, then, for the actual legal connection of Church and State in England. A greater *congeries* of absurdities, and worse than absurdities, wearing the solemn name of law, it would be difficult to find. It was to be expected, that whenever the Church should arouse herself to a deeper sense of her vocation, and a more earnest discharge of her awful duties, and so be led on to a better appreciation of her high prerogatives and inalienable rights, then there would follow an exposure of some part of this system, which, from the time of the third William, had been gradually advancing to the climax of unreality. That time came at last. The Court days of the Church of England ended, as we trust, forever. Less thought was given to the declaration of the Prophet about Kings and Queens becoming nursing fathers and nursing mothers to the Church, and more to the words of CHRIST, that the gospel was to be preached to the poor. The manacles of the State had, indeed, bound the Church's limbs, but they had not stopped the circulation and the movement of her life, and far less had they been able to touch her heart. She woke as the strong man wakes amidst his bonds. It takes time for him to find where they press most heavily and bind with severest pain, and then the first rending is generally made. No wonder, therefore, that the Church felt most strongly as she woke, the State bond that bound her in the very sources of her life, and pressed on the main artery of the Succession. It was a strong case, too, under which she made her effort. One was to be thrust into her high places who lay under the twice repeated ban of her most celebrated University; who was totally rejected by a majority of the Clergy of the Diocese over which he was to be placed; whose election was utterly uncanonical; who was protested against by a majority of the Bishops of his Province; who was only sheltered by a Statute of limitation,—of whose provisions he availed himself, even while he refused to retract one word which he had uttered,—from a trial for Heresy; who was objectionable to by far the greater portion of the Clergy of the Church of England,* and to a majority of those laymen who are her truest sons; who had been forced upon the University as a Professor, by a

* Lord J. Manners' Letter to the Premier. As to the Clergy generally, it is worthy of note, that in Bedfordshire, a section which is mainly under the Russel influence, thirty-two Clergy addressed the Premier in favor of Dr. Hampden, and six Rural Deans and thirty-five Clergy addressed the Bishop of Ely against him.

Sabbath breaking and profligate Premier; and pushed to a Bishopric by a virtually Scotch Presbyterian one. Under such circumstances has it been, that the Church of England has been awakened to her bondage. Under such circumstances it is, that she has spoken, from the Bishop's throne, and from the Cathedral Chapter House, and from the country Church. A cabinet minister may despise the voice. But it shall enter into the ears of Him, "by whom Kings reign, and Princes decree justice."

It does not come within our purpose to present a detailed history of Dr. Hampden's progress, or that of his opponents, from the day of his nomination to the Diocese of Hereford, Dec. 11, 1847, to that of his long delayed consecration, March 26, 1848. All that we can do, is to notice the more salient points of the eventful tale, and to speak of a few of the more remarkable personages.

Passing over, then, the Remonstrance of the Bishops, with Lord John Russell's exceedingly curt reply; and the Remonstrance of the Laity, in replying to which his Lordship took occasion to display his powers of pathos, as in answering the Bishops he had exhibited those of sarcasm; passing over all this, with the simple remark, that his Lordship's two missives will chiefly be recollected in history, as having been severally annihilated by the Bishop of Exeter, and Lord John Manners, we come to the election at Hereford; and as connected with it, to a subject which demands attention, the conduct of the Dean, Dr. Merewether. No sooner had the *cong   d'  lire* been issued, than the Dean of Hereford memorialized the Crown, desiring that either a new Bishop might be nominated, or else, that Dr. Hampden's writings might be submitted to a competent tribunal, before he himself and the Chapter should be compelled to proceed to the election. With customary official insolence, he was informed that the Crown had "no commands to issue," and of course the election came on.

By the Statutes of the Cathedral Church of Hereford, the election was an illegal one; for they,—and every Dean at his accession to office is, by a legal fiction, we presume, solemnly sworn to obey them;—require distinctly the vote of the Dean as necessary to the valid election of a Bishop. This vote, it is well known, Dr. Hampden did not receive; and while he shall sit on the throne of Hereford, it must be with the plain and distinct fact staring him in the face, that he sits there in violation of, and contradiction to, the Statutes of his own Cathedral Church, over-ridden, crushed, and trampled under foot by the Royal Supremacy, under the guidance of a liberal Premier.

And now a word or two concerning Dr. Merewether personally. Of the report that he had in the most humiliating manner begged of the Queen the Bishopric of Hereford for himself, we can say nothing because nothing as yet is known. One thing, however, is certain, that Dr. Merewether has demanded of the Premier permission to publish every letter and document connected with his participation in this important matter, and that the permission has not been granted. While, if there be rumors to the effect that the Dean of Hereford had sought the Episcopacy for himself, there are also rumors quite as strong and quite as worthy of credit, that Lord John Russell endeavored first to terrify him into voting for Dr. Hampden, by threatening the *præmunire*; and next to wheedle him, by promising him a Bishopric. In the absence, however, of all authoritative documents, Dr. Merewether's demand to publish the whole correspondence, and Lord John Russell's virtual refusal to permit him to do so, tell as strongly against his Lordship as they do in favor of the Dean.

Another very popular story about Dr. Merewether, has been, that at last, to use a common phrase, "he backed out." And this is grounded on the fact, that the three certificates to the Crown, the Archbishop, and the Bishop elect, were in the name of the Dean and Chapter. The publication, however, of all the Documents, has given this affair quite another aspect. It appears now, that in the first place, the Dean's protest against the election was appended to each of these several certificates; that in the body of the certificate to the Bishop elect, the important words, "no one dissenting therefrom," and "unanimously," were omitted; that in announcing the election in the Choir of the Cathedral, he did it, not in the usual form, but by speaking of a majority of the Chapter; that he endeavored to use the same form in the certificates, but was overruled by a majority; that he refused to affix the capitular seal; and finally, that he informed the Premier that he had no wish to shelter himself under legal forms or fictions of any kind, from the full and entire responsibilities in which his course involved him. The conduct of Dean Merewether, therefore, appears throughout to be marked with courage, integrity, disinterestedness and honor. Whether his grounds of objection against Dr. Hampden were or were not sufficient, still his opposition is clearly honest, and his course is magnanimous and true-hearted. It is a bright spot in the sombre story.

Still, the question has been asked, whether it would not have been better that the Dean should, after the election, have

refused any further participation in the matter, and have left to other hands the drawing up and sending of the several certificates? We should say, decidedly, it would not. The very same form of certificate would still have been adhered to,—for we must not forget we are in a land of fictions,—and the Dean's opposition would not have appeared, as it does now appear on the record, standing out in its honest dignity. Had he pursued the course suggested, history would probably in time have forgotten his opposition; and the election of Dr. Hampden at Hereford would have stood undistinguished from other elections. Whereas, now, it must wear forever the stigma of illegality. And this stigma, unpleasant as it might be to do it, the Dean was, under the circumstances, in conscience bound to affix to it.

From the illegal election, we advance to the forced confirmation, made in Bow Church, by the Archbishop's commissioners on the eleventh of January, 1848. The farcical and humiliating details of that miserable mockery are too fresh in our readers' memories to need that we should here repeat them. Nor perhaps is it necessary to do more than to allude to the divided opinion of the Queen's Bench; divided, that is, as to numbers, for when law, reason and common sense are taken into the account, the weight of argument all lies upon one side; and to hasten to the conclusion of the scene, by saying, that thus driven on by the supremacy over all opposers, Dr. Hampden was, in the face of strong and solemn Protests, consecrated Bishop of Hereford, on Sunday, March 26th, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, a Prelate whom it is impossible to name without deep respect, assisted by the Bishops of Worcester, Landaff, and Norwich. The Bishops of London and Winchester, who are usually present, it is understood, declined to give their assistance: a circumstance which probably is without a parallel.

We have run through these historical details with very great rapidity, because our object has chiefly been, to show the actual power on the part of the Crown, of interfering in that very sacred right of the Church, the Election of a Bishop. And thereby, to demonstrate the absurdity of the ordinary way of saying, that the good sense of the Crown, or the good feeling of the Premier, or the force of public opinion, or some other very powerful obstruction, would always regulate the administration of such a statute, as that of the 25th, Henry VIII, and so prevent it from ever being really used tyrannically against the Church. This is poor comfort, and poorer defense, against a bad law. And they who have so long con-

- soled themselves with it, have at last found out its worthlessness. For here, in this very free and enlightened age, in this very year, 1848, this very statute has been used by a liberal Premier for the benefit of Latitudinarian Bishop, and stifling all inquiry, and stopping every body's mouth, has thrust him into the See of Hereford. King Henry himself could not have wielded his statute more dexterously than Lord John Russel has done.

These last words suggest to us another point, the consideration of which was purposely omitted in our historical review, that it might be treated by itself. From first to last, from 1832 to 1848, the single wish and purpose of Dr. Hampden's opponents have been, to bring his works to a fair trial before a competent tribunal. It is very well known how pertinaciously the heads of Houses at Oxford refused to bring things to such an issue, and that the only thing they would consent to do was to allow the statute of 1836 to be brought forward in Convocation; which statute, it should be remembered, the University could not debate upon, but simply affirm or reject by Yes or No. And yet in the very face of those notorious facts, Dr. Hampden could write in 1838 to the Archbishop of Canterbury, actually complaining that he had had no hearing, when he could not but have known, that the Hebdomadal Board at Oxford had most continuously and resolutely done every thing in their power, (and that was much,) to prevent any thing of the sort. And how has it been within the last few months? A fair hearing and decision before a competent tribunal; this has been the one, open, honest, fair demand of Dr. Hampden's opposers. And now, while Dr. Hampden on the one hand complains to Lord John Russell, in that self-laudatory letter which is so amusingly characteristic of its author, while Dr. Hampden on the one hand, complains of this very demand as being quite akin in its spirit to the Inquisition itself, Dr. Whately on the other hand, with that hardihood of assertion, which distinguishes his Grace's *brochures*, declares, that a trial was all which Dr. Hampden ever desired! We certainly do not pretend to account for the discrepancy. If Dr. Hampden ever desired a trial, it was perfectly within his power to have had it. He never has had it, he has always shrank from it, and the fair inference is, that he has been afraid of it. He knows—he can not but know—it were an insult to his common sense to suppose any thing else,—that the agitation can not be settled by a Theological defense, couched in general terms, and addressed to a Prime Minister. He knows—he can not but know—that it is worse than idle to challenge

his opposers to prove their allegations from his writings, while he prevents the proof from being decided on by any competent and satisfactory tribunal. His whole letter to Lord John Russell, is an unworthy attack upon the character of his opponents, an attempt to misrepresent their motives, to affix the stigma of a party movement to the opposition made to him, and to exalt himself at the expense of others. There are words and epithets that could very justly be applied to it, but we honestly confess that we do not care to use them.

But it may be asked, was not a trial begun, and then given up, for some reason or another? That is a matter on which we would gladly have been silent, and yet it is one which could not well be avoided, in writing at all on this subject. It opens up a painful scene, and yet truth and justice require us to look at it, more especially, as it has been made the ground of undeserved imputations against the excellent and amiable Bishop of Oxford. We shall give the simple facts; our reader's sense of honor will supply the commentary.

The University of Oxford, as such, not being under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Hampden, as a Professor, was not amenable to his authority. But as Rector of Ewelme in the Diocese of Oxford he was; and accordingly with the Bishop's permission,—without which it would not have been done,—proceedings were commenced against him in the Arches Court for heresy. After the suit had been instituted, the promoters of it suggested to the Bishop, that as the satisfaction of the Church was the only object had in view in instituting it, it might be that Dr. Hampden would give him such explanations as would render its further prosecution unnecessary; and they accordingly agreed to suspend the suit, while the Bishop should communicate with Dr. Hampden. Bishop Wilberforce then addressed to Dr. Hampden a letter, in which he stated, in detail, the points of doctrine which it was alleged had been impugned, and asked if he were willing to affirm his full belief in them. And moreover, he inquired whether he would withdraw the "Observations on Dissent," and the "Bampton Lectures." To this letter Dr. Hampden replied, affirming his belief in the points of doctrine specified, but passing over in entire silence the Bishop's proposition as to withdrawal. This silence the Bishop very naturally understood as a refusal to withdraw the works, and was about permitting the suit to proceed. A few days after he had so written to Dr. Hampden, his Lordship came to Oxford to hold an Ordination in his Cathedral. He was the guest of Dr. Hawkins, Provost of Oriel, and the intimate friend of Dr.

Hampden. During the Bishop's stay, Dr. Hampden found it necessary to send a formal note from his own house to that of Dr. Hawkins, a distance of a few yards, to inform Dr. Hawkins, with whom for many years he had been in daily habits of friendly intercourse, "that it was with no sanction of his" that the *Observations on Religious Dissent* were sold or circulated; that he had put forth no copies of the second edition since its publication, &c. &c., which statements, of course, brought that work under the shelter of the law of limitations. A highly necessary communication, certainly, to make to Dr. Hawkins! A most opportune time for making it! And yet, Dr. Hampden, in afterward writing to the Bishop of Oxford, has the effrontery to say, that Dr. Hawkins was never *authorized* to show the communication to him, and that he regrets it has gone further. Dr. Hawkins, however, did show it to the Bishop, and therein, no doubt, fulfilled the very intention with which the note had been written.

At this point, therefore, the Bishop, as he supposed, had befored him these two things. Dr. Hampden's assertion of belief in the doctrines alleged to have been impugned by him; and his statements bringing the "*Observations on Dissent*" within the operation of the law of limitation. There remained, therefore, only the "*Bampton Lectures*," and these, after Dr. Hampden's explanations, made in his letter to Lord John Russell, and some others *communicated to him by Dr. Hawkins*, the Bishop did not deem a sufficient ground on which to promote a suit of heresy; though he did consider the *Observations on Dissent*, without the intervention of the statute, affording sufficient ground for such a suit. He therefore withdrew his letters of request, and the suit was at an end.

No sooner had this taken place, than Dr. Hampden, safe now under the statute of Limitations which protected him from trial for his "*Observations on Dissent*," and under his explanations, which prevented a trial on his *Bampton Lectures* alone, wrote to a friend at Cambridge, and gave his Bishop the lie, in the following words: "The Bishop of Oxford would insinuate in his letter to the Times, that I have made concessions to him. I shall be obliged to you most positively to discredit any such statement should you hear it alleged—it is not true." This letter his friend saw fit to publish. Hereupon the Bishop of Oxford, anxious to know if by these statements Dr. Hampden intended to renounce the benefit of the Limitation Statute, addressed to him a note, requesting to be informed whether he did or did not make to Dr. Hawkins those statements, which relieved him from all re-

sponsibility for the Observations on Dissent during the two years limitation of the Clergy Discipline Bill. To this note, he received, we venture to say, the most remarkable reply that was ever given by a Presbyter to a Bishop. The statements made by Dr. Hawkins were, Dr. Hampden informs the Bishop, perfectly true. But neither Dr. Hawkins nor his Cambridge friend had any right to use, as they did, his communications. "Each was intended only for the person to whom they were addressed." And this, in the face of his own words to the latter, "I should be obliged to you most positively to contradict any such statements." We are sick, heartily sick, and we doubt not our readers are also, of this miserable scene of trickery and subterfuge. Dr. Hampden declares he retracts nothing, and yet shelters himself under the statute of two years limitation. He writes a note to the Provost of Oriel, which he must have known the Bishop of Oxford would see, and then snubs his Lordship for having noticed it. In short, it is a cleverly managed piece of scheming. The Bishop of Oxford is tricked. Dr. Hampden's trial is avoided. And there are some other results which, we think, will suggest themselves to our readers' minds without assistance on our part.

And now, through these mazes of sixteen years, trodden perseveringly, and with that single aim which some men seem to have, the goal is reached at last, and the Bishop's Throne and the vote in the House of Lords are safe and sure. The Premier and the Professor both have triumphed. The Bishops have been put down. The Clergy and the Laity have been taught their places. The English world has been divided into two great parties, Dr. Hampden's friends, and Dr. Hampden's opponents: and the former, though fewer far in numbers, have triumphed over the latter. With the same persevering consistency of purpose which he displayed in 1836, unmoved to any sacrifice on his own part by the agitation of the Church, unroused to any thing beyond eager exculpations of himself, and strong personal denunciations of his opponents, sheltering himself under every statute that can aid him, and throwing off the responsibility of such sheltering upon the shoulders of others; grasping in 1847, the "*Magna Charta of Tyranny*," as his support, when, in 1834, he shuddered and grew pale at the slightest interference of law in matters of religion, Dr. Hampden, by a path far safer than it is sublime, has reached the highest elevation in the Church. It is a triumph. It can be looked on no otherwise, if we consider persons merely, and not principles. No doubt he so regards it,

and now complacently surveys his prostrate foes, and laughs with the Premier at their vain attempts to vindicate the Church's honor and most sacred rights. Personally, we repeat it, it is a triumph.

But, whether the Premier and the new Bishop of Hereford do or do not take them, there are other views involving more awful issues, more far reaching results than this. It is a matter, in itself, of the least possible importance, that Dr. Hampden has become one of the Fathers of the English Church. We look for no results whatever from that fact. It will, as a fact, occupy but a small space in history. The personal triumph is forgotten, the person himself passes from view, when we remember what principles this struggle has evoked, what weakness it has revealed, what strength it has demonstrated, what life it has proved. But a few short years at most, and all the actors in the stirring scene of the last few months, from the crowned Monarch of England, down to the humblest curate who has added his voice to that of his brethren, will be slumbering in the dust. The short-lived flush, the quickly passing self-gratulation of personal success, it is hardly worth while to think on these at all; although at the present moment, they no doubt seem all in all to the two victorious fellow combatants. Men know not what they do, when they stir up mighty deeps of truth, and right, and life. They may laugh as the far down groundswell gently tosses their barks, without endangering them: and forget, that after they have gained the harbor, the swell may work upward, even to the surface, with a steady onward force, resistless and unconquerable. It may be that Lord John Russell is the last Prime Minister of England, who will wield the statute of King Henry's tyranny. It may be, that Dr. Hampden is the last Bishop who will be borne by it, in the face of strong opposition, to the bench of the Episcopacy.

Whether that be so or no, one thing is sure. The Church knows now the full extent of her bondage, and it is her own fault if that bondage comes not to a speedy end. She knows now, the shams, the mockeries, the triflings with the most awful of all vows and obligations, which the Union of Church and State, as at present constituted, involves; and it is her own fault, if truth, and right, and reverence for God, do not sweep away these solemn fictions, which have no reality but the reality of shame. She knows now the deep and spreading life that beats in her pulses, and wells out from her heart; and it is her own fault, if she suffers that life to be bandaged, and bound up, and interfered with, by a Crown, which is the pup-

pet of a Parliament, that is not only *not* composed of her members, but does embrace her very deadliest foes. We look for no sudden movement. We hope for no sudden outbreak. The issues of any such thing would be questionable ; its evils must be manifold. Not with carnal weapons must this strife be fought, this victory gained. Let her increase in holy self-devotion, in self-sacrificing labors, in ministries of mercy to the poor, in prayers, in alms, in self-denial, and in all those notes which, summed together, make up the great note HOLY, and our Mother Church can not be made the slave of man again. The fetters, golden though they be, and gorgeous in the world's view, shall fall from off her limbs, without the aid of earthly might. Made free in Christ's own truth, she shall be free indeed. Glorious "*within*," "the King's daughter" shall appear to the world's eye, in "clothing of wrought gold."

HOYT'S SKETCHES OF LIFE AND LANDSCAPE.

ART. VII.—*Sketches of Life and Landscape, in Ten Poems.*By Rev. R. HOYT. New York: Spalding & Shepherd.
1848. 8vo.

THE true poet must be a genuine lover of nature. The eye, "in fine frenzy rolling," must survey the world without, as well as the world within. The moonlight scene, the woodland walk, the mountain glen, and the forest glade, what attends and surrounds us in our daily paths,—

"The common earth, the air, the skies,

familiar sounds and familiar landscapes, the opening bud and the rustling leaf, the velvet lawn and the waving grain, the rock, the tree, the streamlet, the ocean, all combine to elicit the poet's power and to awaken him to the perception and enjoyment of nature, in her varied beauty. And the exquisite perfection of his art, lies as truly in the graphic description of these, as in the masterly delineation of intense human passions, or of excited human feelings. We can give no definition of poetry, that will confine it to a particular class of objects and employments. It is as various as the passions and characters of mankind and the aspects of inanimate nature. And readers and critics are equally various in their tastes and judgments. Some love only the verse which exhibits glowing pictures of dramatic scenes,—which portrays the energies called into exercise by struggle and conflict, and kindles alike men's sympathies and imaginations; or which, selecting a single passion, traces it through all its wanderings and windings, and thus gives more of the soul of intense passion than of the features of nature. Others with minds of a more sober or more antique cast, are enamored of the old ballad and the old Romance,—the Border Minstrelsy with scattered traditions and reminiscences of the past. They love best the Lyric Lays, the minstrel whose delight it is, like Wordsworth,—

—"Alone in summer shade
To pipe a simple song for thinking hearts."

And there are others, again, who would have the music of the poet's mind always attuned to the service of the Church; who would mingle the tide of song with the tide of religious feeling, and commend nothing "dipped in the dews of Castalia" unless baptized also with the HOLY GHOST, and with the fire of Divine Truth. We rejoice at the consecration of genius to holy and Christian themes. We rejoice when the smooth and flow-

ing numbers of the poet are given to God and his Church ; and had the muse endowed *us* with the gift of song—had we bathed *our* lips in the Caballine fount, or slept on double-topped Parnassus—we would seize the way

“Distinct with signs—through which, in fixed career,
As through a zodiac, moves the ritual year
Of England's Church.”

But in saying this, we must not be understood as ready to exclude from the rank of tasteful and touching and noble poetry, “harmonious numbers” devoted to the consideration of less holy themes. Wordsworth is as truly a poet in his “Excursion,” as in his “Sonnets,” and the Christian Cowper has no more of the *vivida vis animi*, in his Hymns, than in his “Task” and “Table Talk.” “The groves were God's first temples,” and in their calm and solemn shades men may meditate—

“His milder majesty,
And, to the beautiful order of his works,
Learn to conform the order of their lives.”

The truth is, poetry holds up the mirror to nature. Wherever a being exists, actuated by the thoughts and feelings and passions of man ; wherever a landscape spreads, or the mighty and majestic ocean rolls, wherever the blue arch of heaven bends, or the stars twinkle, or the clouds lower ; wherever the shrill wind whispers, or the storm rages, or the birds sing, there are the elements of poetry ; and whoever has an eye to see and a soul to feel them, has the spirit of poetry. “Man,” says Hazlitt in his *Lectures on the English Poets*, “is a poetical animal : and those of us who do not study the principles of poetry, act upon them all our lives, like Moliere's *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, who had always spoken prose without knowing it. The child is a poet, in fact, when he first plays at hide-and-seek, or repeats the story of Jack the Giant-Killer ; the Shepherd boy is a poet, when he first crowns his mistress with a garland of flowers ; the countryman when he stops to look at the rainbow ; the city apprentice when he gazes after the Lord Mayor's show ; the miser when he hugs his gold ; the courtier who builds his hopes upon a smile ; the savage who paints his idol with blood ; the slave who worships a tyrant, or the tyrant who fancies himself a god ; the coward, the beggar and the king, the rich and the poor, the young and the old, all live in a world of their own making ; and the poet does no more than describe what all the others think and act.” He must, indeed, study in the school and imbibe the spirit of a Holy Religion. He must look upon whatever passes before

his mental vision with a fixed devotion to truth and purity. If his verse is not what would be called religious poetry, he must make his readers feel,—whether he sings of nature or of human life,—that they are all along in company with the spirit of a single-hearted and meditative Christian. There must be no chilling misanthropy; no brilliant corruscations of a splendid genius flashing forth, only to make the darkness of error and immorality more painfully evident.

The "Sketches of Life and Landscape," are from the pen of a clergyman of the Church. They are printed in a style of really elegant typography, and first appeared in the fugitive form of numbers. The volume before us is a collection of these numbers, arranged by the author, and sent forth without a line of Preface, or a note of explanation. The themes are familiar ones, but he touches the "Old" and "New" with beautiful simplicity and grace. We do not, it is true, find in Mr. Hoyt's "Sketches," the *membra disjecta* of a great Epic poet, but there is a vein of truthfulness, and freshness, and originality pervading them, which shows him to be, beyond question, a true poet, and one possessing no ordinary powers of description. We may confirm our opinion by the following quotation from "Snow, a Rural Sketch of Winter."

'Tis Winter, yet there is no sound
 Along the air,
 Of winds upon their battle-ground,
 But gently there,
 The snow is falling,—all around
 How fair—how fair!

The jocund fields would masquerade;
 Fantastic scene!
 Tree, shrub, and lawn, and lonely glade
 Have cast their green,
 And joined the revel, all arrayed
 So white and clean.

E'en the old posts, that hold the bars,
 And the old gate,
 Forgetful of their wintry wars
 And age sedate,
 High capped, and plumed, like white hussars,
 Stand there in state.

The drifts are hanging by the sill,
 The eaves, the door;
 The hay-stack has become a hill;
 All covered o'er
 The wagon, loaded for the mill
 The eve before.

The "Sketches" are not all marked by the same degree of merit. That his muse, as Burns has said, "though hamely in attire, may touch the heart," he appears in some to have studied too much simplicity. His personal histories and the allegory of the "White Dragon," as they are among the first, so they are among the most inferior of his "Ten Poems." We can not withhold from the reader a few stanzas from the "World Sale—a Moral Sketch."

"THE WORLD FOR SALE!—Hang out the sign;
Call every traveler here to me;
Who'll buy this brave estate of mine,
And set me from earth's bondage free!
'T is going!—yes, I mean to fling
The bauble from my soul away;
I'll sell it, whatsoe'er it bring;
The World at Auction here to-day!

"It is a glorious thing to see,—
Ah, it has cheated me so sore!
It is not what it seems to be:
For sale! It shall be mine no more.
Come, turn it o'er and view it well;
I would not have you purchase dear;
'T is going—going! I must sell!
Who bids! Who'll buy the Splendid Tear!"

* * * * *

"Ah cheating earth!—could man but know,
Sad soul of mine, what thou and I,—
The bud would never wish to blow,
The nestling never long to fly!
Perfuming the regardless air;
High soaring into empty space;
A blossom ripening to despair,
A flight—without a resting place!

"No more for me life's fitful dream;
Bright vision, vanishing away!
My bark requires a deeper stream:
My sinking soul a surer stay.—
By Death, stern sheriff! all bereft,
I weep, yet humbly kiss the rod:
The best of all I still have left,—
My Faith, my Bible, and my God."

We should be glad to extract freely from the succeeding Poems,—but our limits will restrict us to a single quotation from "Old,—a Sketch of Rural Life." The "hoary pilgrim" is first introduced sitting

"By the way side, on a mossy stone,"
in sad meditation, when a sweet spirit breaks the silent spell

and invites him to her cottage, while she asks the cause of his wandering hither.

"Angel, said he sadly, I am old;
 Earthly hope no longer hath a morrow,
 Yet why I sit here thou shalt be told,
 Then his eye betrayed a pearl of sorrow,—
 Down it rolled;
 Angel, said he sadly, I am old!

"I have tottered here to look once more
 On the pleasant scene where I delighted
 In the careless, happy days of yore,
 Ere the garden of my heart was blighted
 To the core!
 I have tottered here to look once more!

"All the picture now to me how dear!
 E'en this grey old rock where I am seated,
 Seems a jewel worth my journey here;
 Ah, that such a scene must be completed
 With a tear!
 All the picture now to me how dear!

"Old stone School-house!—it is still the same!
 There's the very step so oft I mounted!
 There's the window creaking in its frame,
 And the notches that I cut and counted
 For the game;
 Old stone School-house! it is still the same!"

We would go on and give more of the old man's musings upon the spot where his youthful joys had been passed—but we must bring our Review to a close, by recommending the admirers of descriptive poetry to possess themselves of Mr. Hoyt's life-like "Sketches." Though a Clergyman of the Church, we have seen nothing from his pen, that speaks her praises or encourages a steady love of her shining excellence. We say not this to doubt the piety of the poet—for this is evident from his published verse—but simply to suggest whether "Life and Landscape" might not sometimes be left, and descriptive powers so ample, employed in the noblest of all services—the service of the Church. The gift of song is God's, and to turn it to his highest glory must be the pleasure alike of the Pastor and the Poet.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE UNALTERED AUGSBURG CONFESSION, as the same was read before and delivered to the Emperor Charles V, of Germany, June 25, 1530: and the three chief Symbols of the Christian Church: with historical Introductions and critical and explanatory Notes. By CHRISTIAN HEINRICH SCHOTT, Pastor of St. Peter's Church, Leipzig. Carefully translated from the German. New York, H. Ludwig & Co., 1848. pp. 203. 12mo.

This work, in its present form, is thoroughly Lutheran; having been compiled in 1829, by a Lutheran Pastor in Germany, and recently translated by a German Lutheran in this country; and for general use among Lutherans in both countries, it is both appropriate and valuable. This Confession will for centuries to come also possess general interest.

The historical Introduction to the Augsburg Confession, occupies forty-five closely printed pages, and contains a brief but lucid account of the origin, presentation, reception, and subsequent history of this Confession, with constant references to the best authorities. The Notes do not enter into doctrinal discussions, but are chiefly occupied with historical explanations of the allusions in the Confession to ancient and modern sects and heresies.

The Confession itself was drawn up for the express purpose of being presented to the German Emperor, and Princes, at the Diet of Augsburg, in 1530; and it was intended to be, rather an Apology of the Protestants for their innovations on the faith and practices of the Romish Church, than a full and fearless statement of all their religious sentiments. The compilation of it was, therefore, assigned to Melancthon, as being the most competent to express their united views, in a manner the least offensive to Romanists. Melancthon labored the composition most intensely, and was aided by the ablest of the Lutheran divines, to whose criticism it was repeatedly subjected. Luther carefully inspected it, and pronounced it better than he himself could have made it. Hence, this Confession, while it had the sanction of all the Lutherans, and was, in fact, a true exposition of their opinions, contained phraseology, arguments and illustrations, which would not have been adopted, probably, in other circumstances; and it omitted to notice many objectionable things in Romanism, because they were viewed as not absolutely essential; and because the Protestants wished to narrow the grounds of controversy with their adversaries as much as possible. Thus they do not scruple to apply the name of *Mass* to their own worship. They say, (Art. 24.) "Our Churches are falsely accused that they have abolished the *Mass*; for it is well known that the *Mass* is celebrated among us with greater devotion and seriousness than it is among our opponents." So also, in Art. 11 and 12, they profess not to have discarded altogether, but only to have purified and corrected, the Popish doctrines of Auricular Confession and Penances. On the subject of three Orders in the Ministry; also the precise use and authority of Tradition, and the importance of uniformity in worship, as well as on some others, the language of this Confession is not very clear and discriminating. And as a whole, this Confession is inferior in precision, fullness and perspicuity, to the Confessions presented at the same Diet by Zwingli, and by the four cities of Strassburg, Constance, Memmingen and Lindau; and in appealing to it for a correct knowledge of the religion of Lutherans, we should never forget the circumstances and the design of its composition.

The translation of the book from German into English appears to have

been made in good faith, but with a better knowledge of the German language than of the English. Hence it occasionally offends against the rules of grammatical construction, as well as against propriety in the use of words. Thus we find *armour* used for arms, (p. 25;) *domination* for dominion, (p. 22;) *conversation* for conference, (p. 38;) *courtizans* for courtiers, (p. 136;) *the divine* for the clergy, (p. 177;) and we meet with constructions like the following: the number *were*, (was,) (p. 25;) faith *to* (in) God, (p. 84;) *glorify* (exalt) it into the image of God, (p. 95;) imagines *to receive*, (that he shall receive,) (p. 104;) the *sense* of those words *are*, (is,) (p. 108;) *from out* of purgatory, (from purgatory, or, out of purgatory,) (p. 144;) *substituted by* (exchanged for,) (p. 156;) *if—so*, (instead of *as—so*, in a case of exact parallelism,) (p. 46;) *to harrow up*, (*rake together*) many apologies, (p. 121;) have *lacked* (failed) of grace, (p. 161;) &c. &c. These violations of good English will not seriously embarrass the reader, but they mar the beauty of the composition; and they show that the translator, (who was doubtless a foreigner,) should have submitted his translation to the verbal correction of some person better acquainted with the English language.

The three ancient Creeds, (the Apostle's, the Nicene, and the Athanasian,) together with the brief Introductions and Notes to them, occupy but 17 pages; and they present to us nothing which is either new or of particular interest.

ROMANCE OF THE EARLY HISTORY OF LOUISIANA: A Series of Lectures.
By CHARLES GAYARRE. New York, D. Appleton & Co. 12 mo. 1848.

The author of this work, while preserving, in the main, the accuracy of an historian, has certainly succeeded in his design of "honeying the cup of useful knowledge and making it acceptable to the lips of the multitude." He has produced a work which will be popular, and has thrown an interest over the early efforts of the French and Spaniards in America, which we can not but think is due chiefly to his own genius.

The French Colonies in Canada and Louisiana, and the early Spanish Colonies in Florida, were deficient in all the elements which ensure success, and their history is a record of disasters, which can be traced distinctly to their proper source, in the character and habits of the Colonists, and their neglect of all the natural means of increase and prosperity.

The work begins with the expedition of De Soto in 1539, but the poetic license in which our author frequently indulges, might have led him back to the times of Ponce De Leon, and we can not but regret that this worthy Knight and his famous expedition through the Floridas, in search of the fountain which would make old men young again, were not included in the Romance of Louisiana. It is true, Ponce De Leon did not find the fountain, but neither did De Soto find the gold of which he was in search, and there is certainly as much romantic interest in the first Spanish expedition, as in the succeeding ones of Narvaez, Grijalva and De Soto, while it is not stained with those excessive cruelties which mark the latter.

Our author, we are glad to see, asserts that De Soto saw and crossed the Mississippi, a fact which the French have not been always ready to admit. The French and English claims to the discovery of this noble river, are now, we believe, acknowledged to be without good foundation.

The grand enterprise of Joliet and Marquette, the first Frenchmen who ever saw the Mississippi, is duly chronicled, and the frail bark drifting down the current, is thought to be no way inferior to the far-famed vessel of Argos in quest of the golden fleece; but why did not our author give us the romantic history of the death of Father Marquette, as narrated by Charlevoix? Is the whole story fabulous?

In the expedition of La Salle, Father Hennepin is not thought worthy of mention, and his name, we believe, does not occur throughout the work. That he never descended the Mississippi, has been fully proved, and doubtless he merited his title of "the great liar," yet he unquestionably gave the name of Louisiana to the vast country which he claimed to have discovered; and his splendid accounts produced no little sensation both in France and England.

On the whole, we commend the work as both entertaining and instructive. The sketches of character as well as of events, are not without merit. Mr. Gayarre is certainly a bold writer, for he has ventured a full sketch of Maurepas, whose every feature stands out so distinctly before us, as portrayed by the masterly hand of Carlyle. Besides the intrinsic merit of the work, we are glad to hail it from New Orleans, and that the Romance of Louisiana is given us by one of her own sons. This is as it should be.

The Anglo-Americans, not content with swallowing up the ancient territory of the French and Spaniards, are making fearful inroads on the fair fields of literature which lie temptingly open before them, and are searching for the hidden treasures of history with as much eagerness as ever French or Spanish adventurers displayed in search of gold.

We might add, that considerable light will be thrown upon the subject of the acquisition of Louisiana, by the publication of the voluminous and valuable MSS. of the late Hon. Timothy Pitkin, LL. D., which are now in the hands of his son, Rev. T. C. Pitkin, who, we trust, will not long withhold them from the public.

THE POETICAL WORKS OF JAMES HASKINS, A. B. M. B., Trinity College, Dublin. Edited by HENRY BALDWIN, A. M., of Osgood Hall, U. C., Barrister at Law. Hartford, H. S. Parsons, 1848. pp. 320.

The author of this volume was a Medical practitioner, who left his native Dublin, after the losses and misfortunes of his father, and emigrated to North America, establishing himself at Belleville, on the Bay of Quinte, U. C. Here he married, and "enjoyed a season of domestic felicity which proved as transient as it was bright." His amiable and beautiful wife died first, and in the autumn of 1845, Dr. Haskins himself, though "a muscular man," closed his labors, being then in the prime of life. His "constitution sank under the combined influence of accumulated causes." According to his biographer, "the exposure, incident to the practice of medicine, and the intense exercise of the cerebral functions in Poetic composition, are among all legitimate accompaniments of certain occupations, the two that have been found to operate with the greatest effect, against longevity." Whether the production of these Poems hastened Dr. Haskins' days or not,—we are unable to discern the great benefit which his friend has conferred upon his memory, by giving them to the public. To say they are without merit, would be untrue,—but they certainly reflect more honor upon the heart than the head of the author, proving him to have been a better Christian than Poet. The themes are all sacred, and the longest Poem in the book, embracing nearly one hundred pages, is the Cross, in three parts. The muse of a Milton alone could treat with propriety so mysterious a subject. This is one of the concluding stanzas, and one of the best.

"O SAVIOUR! now this hand its harping stays,
If I have sung amiss, be *mine* the blame;
If otherwise, be *THINE* alone the praise!
But condemnation can my spirit claim—

Mine be th' unworthiness, and mine the shame.
 Yet—yet to me, and my weak work extend
 Thy pardon and forgiveness: tho' my name
 Be breathed but with derision—JESU! lend
 One fav'ring smile; lead and conduct me, to life's end."

The "Hymns and Sacred Poems" are many of them pleasant and some of them beautiful; but they must have had a charm in the family and social circle which they lose in the printed volume. We are unwilling, however, to apply severe criticism, where we find such a vein of deep and fervent piety, and so we terminate our imperfect notice.

COMMENTARIES SUITED TO OCCASIONS OF ORDINATION. By WILLIAM WHITE, D. D., Bishop of the Prot. Epis. Church in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. 12 mo. pp. 262. New York, Stanford & Swords, 1848.

These Commentaries, by the sainted White, were the result of the author's great care and jealousy for the honor and well being of the Church, while engaged in his duty of admitting men to serve at her sacred Altars as Deacons and Priests. For several years they were used by the author in manuscript, and were afterward published in a Magazine for his own use. At the suggestion of the Rt. Rev. Bishop Bowen, and by the recommendation of the House of Bishops in 1832, they were given to the public.

These "Commentaries are a minute examination of the solemn import of the Questions, proposed to Deacons and Priests respectively, at the time of their Ordination;" to which is added a "Commentary on the duties of the Public Ministry." The former are exceedingly faithful and practical. The latter embraces much valuable historical information as to the arrangement and order of the Services in the American Church, and gives many important suggestions also of a practical nature. Candidates for either of the two lower Orders of the Ministry, will find this book of great service; and the Clergy will, by its use, feel their own hearts aroused to a higher sense of duty.

HISTORICAL VIEW OF THE LITERATURE OF THE SOUTH OF EUROPE. By J. C. L. SIMONDE DE SISMONDI. Translated from the original, with Notes, and a Life of the Author, by THOMAS ROSCOE. From the last London Edition, including all the Notes from the last Paris Edition. Vols. 1 and 2. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1848.

This work would form a fine subject for an appropriate paper for our Review, which we should be happy to receive from some one of our contributors. Meanwhile, we give a slight sketch of the Author, and of the history of the work itself. The family of Sismondi were originally Italians, and lived subsequently in France, and at Geneva, where the Author was born in A. D. 1773. The unsettled and revolutionary state of affairs in those times, led to his residence successively in France, England, and again in Geneva, and eventually at Tuscany, the home of his ancestors. Here he engaged with ardor in literary pursuits, and was equally the object of suspicion by both French and Austrians, as they became masters of this region, and twice suffered imprisonment for his political opinions.

In A. D. 1800, he returned to Geneva, was made Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce; became intimate with Madame de Staël, and was watched narrowly by the eagle-eyed Bonaparte. Here he published his work on Commercial Wealth, and wrote as a disciple of Adam Smith. In A. D.

1803, he commenced his *History of the Italian Republics*, which was extended to sixteen volumes, and was not issued completely till A. D. 1818. In the winter of 1811-12, he delivered, at Geneva, a course of Lectures on the Literature of the South of Europe, which he elaborated during his residence in Italy, in A. D. 1813, and published in four volumes octavo, in the following year. His familiarity with all the languages and the Literature of Southern Europe, made him entire master of his subject, and his work at once occupied, and has still retained a distinguished place in the public favor. We only add, that the American publishers have brought out the work in a beautiful edition, which will, of course, find its way to every well-furnished private library.

AN AMERICAN DICTIONARY of the English Language, exhibiting the Origin, Orthography, Pronunciation, and Definitions of words. By NOAH WEBSTER, LL.D. Abridged from the Quarto Edition of the Author. To which are added a Synopsis of words, differently pronounced by different Orthoëpists; and Walker's Key to the classical pronunciation of Greek, Latin, and Scripture proper names. Revised and enlarged. By CHAUNCEY A. GOODRICH, Professor in Yale College. With the addition of a vocabulary of Modern Geographical names, with their pronunciation. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1848.

This is not a rival edition of the quarto, which was noticed in our last number, but a large octavo of 1260 pages, adapted to popular use. Though an abridgment from the quarto, it is yet sufficiently full and complete for ordinary use. It is prepared with great care. It contains *all* the words in the quarto edition. The leading etymologies are retained. All the significations of words are preserved, though the definitions are occasionally compressed in their statement, and it is "on a reduced scale, a clear, accurate, and full exhibition of the American Dictionary in all its parts."

There is one peculiarity in this octavo edition, of much importance. Under the more important words, there is given a list of synonyms, or rather of words having the same general signification. There are few writers, we suppose, who have not felt the need of such a list, in order to the attainment of variety and copiousness of diction. Crabb, Carpenter, and Perry, though useful in their place, do not answer the desired end.

Indeed, so important is this feature of the revised Dictionary to the writer and the public speaker, that for popular use, this edition must be sure of a general and permanent circulation. Prof. Goodrich, during the years of hard labor, which he has devoted to this edition, has possessed very important facilities for perfecting the revision, and is admirably qualified for the work which he has so successfully performed.

In respect to the definitions of ecclesiastical terms, we repeat the caution with which we noticed the quarto edition.

PARALLEL REFERENCES. By SAMUEL H. TURNER, D. D., Professor of Biblical Learning and Interpretation of Scripture in the General Theological Seminary of the Prot. Epis. Church. 12mo. pp. 80. New York: Stanford & Swords. 1848.

To one acquainted with the Greek language, we believe that a complete Greek Concordance of the New Testament, is the best Commentary upon it which he can possibly use; and that having accustomed himself thus to make the Bible its own interpreter, he will feel less and less inclination to resort to those "Notes" and "Commentaries," which are now so abundant, but which are not always safe guides. The English reader, of course, must rely

upon "parallel references" judiciously made, by some one thoroughly acquainted with the original languages of the Sacred Volume. We think that Prof. Turner has illustrated the true idea on this subject. His familiarity with the business of instruction has led him to notice those words which most need illustration; and in such cases the references seem to be sufficiently copious. To Sunday School Teachers, and to all careful readers of the Inspired Word, we commend the habit of studying the Scriptures with constant reference to parallel words and phrases, and assure them that they will find this little manual a valuable assistant.

THE WORKS OF THE RIGHT REV. GEORGE HORNE, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Norwich; to which are prefixed Memoirs of his life, studies, and writings. By WILLIAM JONES, M. A. F. R. S. Vols. 1 and 2. 8vo. pp. 466 and 574. New York: Stanford & Swords. 1848.

We can do nothing more now than announce the appearance of this excellent American Edition, of the works of one, whom, his biographer, Jones of Nayland, pronounces to be, "both for matter and manner, one of the first orators and teachers, this (English) Church can boast." His "Commentary on the Psalms," the great work of his life, and on which he spent about twenty years, will be cherished in the Church as long as elegant learning, united with primitive piety, direct its taste.

In an early number of the Review, we propose to do more ample justice to the memory of this remarkable man.

BRIEF MEMOIRS OF THE CLASS OF 1797. By THOMAS CLASS and JAMES MURDOCK. Printed by order of the Class, for their own use, and for distribution to their friends. 8vo. pp. 100. New Haven. 1848.

This Class, which graduated at Yale College in 1797, after an interval of half a century, met for the first time at the last commencement of the College. The class has been distinguished for the *longevity* of its members; twenty-four out of thirty-seven being yet alive. It has been still more distinguished, for the uniformity of the scholarship of the class, as well as the high eminence of several of its members. President Dwight declared, near the close of his life, that he had never instructed more than one other class, which, as a whole, possessed an equal amount of talent. In that class were Henry Baldwin, Lyman Beecher, Thomas Day, Samuel A. Foot, George Griffin, Bethel Judd, James Murdock, Horatio Seymour, and Seth P. Staples. And it is a fact, not without general interest, that one of this class, distinguished for accurate scholarship, commenced the study of the Syriac Language, after having reached the seventieth year of his age, and as we learn from these "Memoirs," now has ready for publication, a Literal Translation of the whole New Testament, from the Paschito Syriac Version, with a preface and marginal notes. It will retain the divisions of the New Testament, as read in the Lessons of the Ancient Syriac Church. It will be in many respects a valuable contribution to modern literature. A very few copies of these "Memoirs," may be obtained by application at the office of the "Church Review."

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND ARTS. Conducted by Professors B. SILLIMAN, and B. SILLIMAN Jr., and JAMES D. DANA. Second Series, May, 1848. Vol. V. No 15. New Haven. Published on the first day of every second month, at \$5,00 per year.

We take pleasure in asking the attention of our readers to this work, the character and design of which are indicated by its title. It is devoted to

the advancement of *Natural Science* in all its branches ; as *Mineralogy*, *Botany*, and *Zoology* ; *Chemistry* and *Natural Philosophy* ; *Mathematics* pure and mixed ; *American Natural History*, and especially our *Geology*.

The application of *Science* to the useful arts, and especially to *Agriculture*, *Manufactures*, and to our *Domestic Economy* generally, is an object of constant attention.

The fine and liberal arts, also, as *Music*, *Sculpture*, *Engraving*, and *Painting*, receive careful consideration ; and very valuable contributions are from time to time communicated by able writers, as the *Index Volume* shows.

This *Journal* originated with *Professor Silliman*, in 1818 ; and after being sustained for thirty years, with indomitable energy and perseverance, amid discouragements which would have appalled most men, has, at last, we are happy to know, secured a living circulation ; which we think is to increase with the attention which our countrymen are evidently paying to physical science, and the useful and fine arts.

We hazard nothing in saying, that *American Science* and *Art* are chiefly indebted to this *Journal* for their reputation abroad ; and for their advancement at home it has also the honor of being one of the earliest and most efficient instrumentalities.

To the accomplished and distinguished *Professor*, whose labors have been associated, we might almost say identified, with the advancement of the *Science* of *Chemistry*, and of *Mineralogy* in our country, this *Journal* will remain for ages to come a noble monument.

To all our readers, who would keep promptly advised of the condition of the *Arts* and *Sciences* at the present day, we confidently commend this work.

CHRISTIAN SONGS. By the Rev. JAMES GILBORNE LYONS, LL. D. "The Service of Song." Third Edition with additions. 12mo. pp. 72. Philadelphia, Geo. S. Appleton. 1848.

These "Christian Songs" are distinguished for scholar-like accuracy, especially their freedom from faulty versification ; and for the pure *Christian sentiment* which thoroughly pervades them. The poet's eye, from nature, in its varied form, turns continually up to nature's God. The songs are thirty-six in number. The xxviii, "The Magnetic Telegraph," and the xxxii, "Images of God," appear to us particularly beautiful.

CHRISTIAN BALLADS. Revised Edition, with additional Ballads. Hartford, Henry S. Parsons, New York : D. Appleton & Co. 1847.

Of these Ballads, our opinion was given at length, in the preceding number.

SAUL, A MYSTERY. By the author of "Christian Ballads," "Athanasion," &c. New York, D. Appleton & Co ; Hartford, H. S. Parsons. 1845.

This tragic poem, by an author who possesses undoubted poetic talent, and that of no common order, has called forth a verdict from the public, by no means unanimous. As tragic poetry is the highest species of poetic composition, so it is the severest test of poetic power. At some future time, this volume may form the subject of an article on the modern drama, when its merits will be examined.

THE CONSISTENCY OF THE WHOLE SCHEME OF REVELATION, with itself and with human reason. By PHILIP N. SHUTTLEWORTH, D. D. Warden of New College, Oxford, and Rector of Foxley Wilts. New York, Harper & Brothers. 18mo. pp. 267. 1848.

We should be glad to see this neat little volume extensively circulated, as it calls attention to a subject too much neglected, at the present time, when there is apparent, so much of contention for superiority, rather than for the

Faith, in its integrity, as opposed to infidelity. Disgusted by this ceaseless controversy, it is to be feared that some men, of reflecting minds, are beginning to regard Revelation as a scheme inconsistent with reason; and on that account to discard, or esteem of little importance, all that is peculiar to doctrinal Christianity. The morality of Revelation they admire; and for the sake of its influence on the mass of society, refrain from opposing it, and even recommend and support it. For this class of minds, the work before us is peculiarly fitted. The author shows in a clear and masterly manner, the entire consistency of Revelation with right reason in all cases wherein reason can be applied; and also, that where the subjects revealed are above or beyond reason, and difficulties arise on that account, a contrary supposition would involve us in still greater difficulties. The sceptic who could be persuaded to read this work with attention and candor, will find that there is no more reason to find fault with the intellectual scheme of Revelation, than with its morality.

We have still another reason for recommending this work. It is addressed to the understanding, rather than to the feelings and the imagination. It calls into exercise the powers of the intellect, and trains it to the discovery and recognition of Truth. Much of the Theological reading of the present day, is exceedingly loose and superficial; and as a consequence, the popular taste is gratified with sermons more showy than solid; distinguished for redundant ornament, rather than clearness and force of reasoning. Could works like the one before us, be extensively circulated and read, we should hope to see this vicious taste corrected, and the pulpit come to be looked upon, rather as a source of instruction than pleasure.

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF A TRINITY. By REV. WILLIAM JONES of Nayland. With a brief notice of the Life of the Author. 18mo. pp. 202. New York, Stanford & Swords. 1848.

The arguments, with which Jones of Nayland so triumphantly vindicated this fundamental doctrine of God's Word against the Socinianism and Infidelity of his day, have lost none of their force or appropriateness after a lapse of almost a hundred years. The American publishers have brought out the work in a neat and attractive form.

THE TRUE CATHOLIC NO ROMANIST. By W. H. ODENHEIMER, A. M. *Third Edition.* 32mo. pp. 158. New York, Stanford & Swords. 1848.

This book was first published in 1845. It is truly a *multum in parvo*; containing enough to satisfy an ordinary inquirer, and meets the great points in the Romish argument on principles which can not be gainsayed.

"**FOOD FOR LAMBS,**" or the Child's Prayer Book, designed as a help to Christian parents, in the nurture of their little ones. To which are added suitable Prayers for the use of public and private schools. Hartford, Henry S. Parsons. 1848.

We are grateful for the promise which this book gives, that Christian nurture is beginning to be understood in its true import; and we are also pleased with the manner in which the compiler and author of this little work has done her duty. The language of the prayers is simple, filial, and devotional.

THE DE SENECTUTE, DE AMICITIA, PARADOXA, and Somnium Scipionis of Cicero, and the **Life of Atticus**, by CORNELIUS NEPOS, with English Notes Critical and Explanatory. By CHARLES ANTHON, LL. D., Professor &c. New York, Harper & Brothers. 1848. 12mo. pp. 350.

It was with feelings of pride and pleasure, that in recently turning over a file of English papers, we noticed an advertisement of an English reprint of

several of the editions of Dr. Anthon's series of the ancient classics. It is a marked tribute to the accuracy and value of his editorial labors. The present work comprises not only the *De Senectute* and *De Amicitia* which are read in several of our Colleges, but also two other works of Cicero not so generally known, and the life of Atticus, by Cornelius Nepos.

The present edition is distinguished by the same accuracy in typography, and also the copiousness and judiciousness in the annotations, for which the learned Professor's other works are justly celebrated.

WANDERINGS AND FORTUNES OF SOME GERMAN EMIGRANTS. By FREDERICK GERSTÄCKER. Translated by DAVID BLACK. 18mo. pp. 270. New York, D. Appleton, & Co.; Philadelphia, Geo. S. Appleton; New Haven, T. H. Pease. 1848.

This volume forms No. 34 of "Appleton's Literary Miscellany." This is a capital story of emigrant and frontier life.

A DISCOURSE on the Life, Character, and Public Services of JAMES KENT, late Chancellor of the State of New York, &c. By JOHN DUER. New York, D. Appleton & Co.; Philadelphia, Geo. S. Appleton. 1848. 8vo. pp. 86.

We think this discourse all that could have been anticipated from the well-known ability of its author. He evidently appreciated thoroughly the character of Chancellor Kent, and has, so far as his limits allowed, traced the successive steps by which that man rose, at length, from comparative obscurity, to the commanding position which he occupied. We doubt not that, to his familiar acquaintance with the ancient classics, derived after he left College, and to his thorough study of the Institutes, Pandects and Code of Justinian, and of the Jurists of France, he was indebted for an undisputed superiority over the Jurists of his age. The life of such a man, viewed as a whole, has, and ought to have, an influence almost incalculable; and Judge Duer has nobly performed the delicate task of sketching that life in miniature.

ANCIENT HYMNS OF HOLY CHURCH. 32mo. pp. 128. Hartford, H. S. Parsons, 1845.

It is, we suppose, absolutely impossible, in any translation of those ancient hymns, to preserve all their excellences entire. How often, for example, has the attempt been made in vain, with the sublime "*Dies Ira*," to retain the smooth versification, the grandeur and majesty of the original. And yet, in the present instance, the translator's sober and cultivated taste, has, we think, furnished in these "Ancient Hymns," some of the purest sacred lyrics in the language.

A FORM OF SELF-EXAMINATION, with a few directions for daily use. 32mo. pp. 32. New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1848.

This is a faithful, heart-searching little manual.

THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN CATECHISED. By Rev. W. H. ODENHEIMER, A. M. 18mo. pp. 110. Second edition. New York, Stanford & Swords, 1848.

A principal object in preparing this book, seems to have been to instruct catechumens in respect to the nature and prominent features of the Church of CHRIST, and to present important events pertaining to her history. It explains the Catholicity of the Church, in distinction from Romish schism

and heresy, to the comprehension of a child. The book bears proof of much industry, and of accuracy.

FIRST LESSONS IN GEOLOGY, Comprising its most important and interesting facts, simplified to the understanding of children. Intended as an Introduction to that Science. By Miss D. W. GODDING. Hartford, H. S. Parsons, 1847.

Our doubts as to the extensive usefulness of this little work do not arise from any hesitancy in respect to the skill of the authoress. On the contrary, her book exhibits familiarity with the subject, and much ingenuity in presenting it to the minds of children. But we doubt whether Geology itself is yet defined with sufficient clearness, in respect to some of its first truths, and many of its proofs, to allow such a simplification; and we also doubt whether children are capable of grasping the subject with any clearness. A work like this, though enlarged, prepared for high schools and academies, might be of service. We ought to have noticed the neatness of the illustrations, and the care with which the publisher has brought out this neat and attractive looking little volume.

THOUGHTS ON THE GOSPEL MIRACLES. By Rev. JOHN WILLIAMS, D. D., Rector of St. George's, Schenectady. New York, Stanford & Swords, 1848. 18mo. pp. 146.

This little work, without the pretension of Trench's recent production on the same subject, will yet be found useful and satisfactory. We are pleased that the author does not regard our SAVIOUR's miracles as mere illustrations of his divine mission, but that he sees under "the outward reality of the miracle a deep and inward significance." It is, we think, evidence of a more devout age, that there is apparent a disposition to study the symbolism of nature; a habit of mind, under which Bishop Horne wrote, and which Jones of Nayland appreciated, and so ably commended. Doubtless, an excessive credulity has sometimes shaped strange fancies and resemblances; but we are gratified to turn from the materialism and barren ratiocinations of the past, to any disposition manifested to identify the God of Nature and the God of Grace, and to see the one shadowed forth in the visible creations of the other. These "Thoughts on the Gospel Miracles," indicate the same habit of devout contemplation, and they will, we are sure, be acceptable to every truly devout mind.

A CATECHISM FOR ROMANISTS AND PROTESTANTS; Respectfully presented to the citizens of Wheeling and its vicinity. 18mo. Wheeling, 1848. pp. 126.

This is a well-meaning, and generally well-executed pamphlet, designed to show the errors and corruptions of Romanism. It seems to be intended merely as a popular thing, and aims rather to give reason than to offer proof. We have no great fancy for this class of works, on questions of this sort. We want something more full, more complete, more authoritative, better fortified with chapter and verse. Those however, whose tastes and inclinations lead them to prefer works of this description, will find this as unexceptionable, and perhaps as satisfactory as any to be met with.

VIEWS OF CHRISTIAN NURTURE, and of subjects adjacent thereto. By HORACE BUSHNELL. Hartford, Edwin Hunt, 1847. 12mo. pp. 252.

Having given our views of the argument of this work, more at length in preceding pages, we wish here only to notice the Note at the end of the vol-

ume; which consists of seven pages, and in which the writer descends from his position as author, and speaks simply as Horace Bushnell. The object of the Note seems to be, to apply the lash to those who have hitherto presumed to question his Orthodoxy. That he anticipates somewhat confidently from this exhibition of his powers, is apparent, in that he reminds his adversaries, that he has now "turned his wrath" upon them; and that "what they suffer is the late, but necessary penalty of what they have done." Alarming! In this Note, he also, at last, gives us the reason why he never replied to "Catholicus," whom some of our readers will doubtless remember. His reason is, that the intellectual disparity between him (Dr. Bushnell) and "Catholicus" is so vast, that he (Dr. B.) did not deign to notice him. This certainly must be a very comfortable feeling to Dr. Bushnell! and withal so modest! But then, we happen to know that there were some, even of Dr. B's way of thinking, who did not form exactly the same opinion of the comparative merits and abilities of Dr. B. and Catholicus; and by his own showing, the pamphlet of the latter has not *proved* so insignificant an affair after all. He then heaps certain opprobrious epithets upon "Catholicus," which are beneath our notice. But, to show of what Dr. B. is capable, we may remark, that he tells a venerable Congregational clergyman, now at the head of a Theological Seminary, and who has held some of the most important posts of usefulness in New England, and with whom he confesses he "has been on good terms" for ten years; that he (the said Professor) is "Scavenger to a Baptist newspaper," and that his "most extraordinary gifts are in his *will*;" and that he is "so bedded in his traditions and formulas, that he can not take the import of any other." In short, this Note exhibits a proficiency in the low art of *scurrility*, and an amount of self-conceit, which do not present Dr. Bushnell before the public in an attitude either very amiable or enviable. We would not, however, arrest the progress of Dr. B's controversy down to the oblivion which awaits it, and which its hero seems determined at all hazards to avoid. Having failed to storm the Vatican, he now turns his muzzle at East Windsor. He reminds us of the fable of the "Fly and the Ox."

AN EXAMINATION OF A BOOK entitled "Discourses on the Apostolical Succession; by W. D. Snodgrass, D. D.," etc. By Rev. WILLIAM JOHNSON, Rector of St. Stephen's Church, Milledgeville, Geo. 12mo. pp. 48. Stanford & Swords, New York, 1848.

This brief work is quite sufficient to prove that the doctrine of the *Apostolical Succession* is as certain, and as true, and as likely to be believed, as before Dr. Snodgrass published his work against it. And we may safely assert, that it will require a much stronger man than Dr. S. has shown himself in this matter, to shake the faith of any well-instructed disciple therein.

THE SCHOOL FUND PERVERTED; or a Review of a Discussion occasioned by the "Propagation of Sectarianism in Common Schools." By a Presbyter of Connecticut. Hartford, H. S. Parsons & Co., 1848. 8vo. pp. 72.

The publication before us grew out of the following circumstances. An attempt having been made by certain members of a Committee on Common Schools to impose, by official commendation, upon the districts of said School Society books of instruction, which, in the judgment of other members of said Committee were liable to objection, a protest was made against the recommendation of such books in said Schools. A public debate followed, and hence the present publication, which professes to give the details of that dis-

cussion. The discussion, however, so far from being confined to the simple question, whether certain books are, as a matter of fact, objectionable to conscientious Churchmen, soon diverged into a doctrinal and denominational dispute, between a Presbyter of the Church and a Congregational Minister; involving almost all the points in dispute between Churchmen and Sectarians, and finally occupied more than twenty evenings.

The Congregational Minister, therefore, appears before the public in this discussion, in two attitudes; first, as the assailant of the doctrinal and ecclesiastical system of the Church, and as the defender of the obnoxious passages in the school books objected to; and secondly, as attempting to impose said school books upon children in the Common Schools, which the children of the Church habitually attend.

We have no account of the discussion except from the pamphlet before us; but judging from this he certainly has no occasion for self-gratulation in respect to the first particular; and as to the second, it shows a spirit of intolerance, which, though it thoroughly pervaded the early colonies of New England, in the days of Roger Williams, we had supposed was now universally repudiated, as it is usually on the anniversary celebrations of the "Landing of the Pilgrims," boldly denied.

The pamphlet is written in a clear and vigorous style; it shows its author to have been thoroughly master of his subject; and as it abounds in authorities, will be useful for future reference.

A SERMON before the Churchmen's Missionary Association for Seamen of the Port of Philadelphia. By Rt. Rev. ALONZO POTTER, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese of Pennsylvania.

ADDRESS to the Sixty-Fourth Annual Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Pennsylvania. By Rt. Rev. A. POTTER, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese.

Both these productions are not only marked by the author's strong masculine style, but both breathe the true missionary spirit, from which, in his important Diocese, great things may, under God, be expected. The twenty-five counties in Pennsylvania, in which the Church has not a minister or sacred edifice, have, as we trust, rich blessings in store.

MODERN INFIDELITY: A Prize Lecture delivered in Trinity Church, Boston, March 15, 1848. By Rev. THOMAS M. CLARK, Assistant Minister of Trinity Church.

THE RELIGIOUS THEORY OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT. An Election Sermon, preached before the "Government of the Commonwealth" of Massachusetts. By Rev. A. H. VINTON, D. D., Jan. 5, 1848.

The above Sermons are bold and admirable discourses, and both suited to the latitude in which they were delivered. We can not resist the impression, that the Church of God is to be the great bulwark of our civil and social institutions in New England, against an industrious and specious radicalism; as well as of the Christian Faith against the mysticism of modern Infidelity.

We also acknowledge the receipt of the following Sermons.

"The Ordinary Gifts;" An Ordination Sermon. By Rev. JOHN WILLIAMS, D. D.

"The Study of Prophecy." By Rev. RICHARD NEWTON.

"The Communion of Saints." By Rev. E. M. JOHNSON.

"The History of St. Andrew's Church, Hanover, Mass." By Rev. SAMUEL CUTLER, Rector.

Also, on occasion of "the Laying of the Corner Stone," of a new Parish Church, in New London, Ct. By Rev. R. A. HALLAM.

Also, the "Address" on that occasion; by the Rt. Rev. J. P. K. HENSHAW, D. D.

Also the following Pamphlets.

An Address on "Collegiate Education," before the House of Convocation of Trinity College. By Rev. J. M. WAINWRIGHT, D. D.; and a Poem on the "Poets of Religion," delivered on the same occasion. By Rev. GEO. BURGESS.

Also the "Address, Constitution," &c., of the Protestant Episcopal Society of New York for Promotion of Evangelical Knowledge.

ENGLISH WORDS FROM THE CELTIC.

THE Celtic family of languages consists of two branches:

I. The Gaelic branch, including 1. Irish, or Gaelic of Ireland; 2. Erse, or Gaelic of the Scottish Highlands; and 3. Mansk, spoken in the Isle of Man.

II. The Cimbric branch, including 1. Cymraeg, or Welsh; 2. Cornish, now extinct; and 3. Armorican, spoken in Bretagne in France.

As the ancient British were the same people with the Welsh, and of course spoke the same language, it is naturally assumed that many Celtic words were adopted by the Anglo-Saxon, and have come down to us. But these words have been so naturalized in Anglo-Saxon, that the separation of the original Celtic element in our language has become a very difficult problem.

The following words, which have been culled from a much longer list of supposed Celtic words, are, it is thought, all Celtic; but as most of them may be attributed to a later intercourse of the English people with the Celtic tribes, they do not meet the difficulties of the problem just stated.

1. *Bard*, (Fr. *barde*), a Celtic minstrel, by extension a poet generally; Ir. *bard*, Gael. *bard*, Welsh *bardd*, from *prydu*, to poetize.

2. *Basket*, (Lat. *bascauda*), a domestic vessel made of twigs or other flexible things interwoven; Ir. *bascaid*, Gael. *bascaid*, Welsh *basged* or *basgawd*.

Barbara de pictis veni *bascauda* Britannis,
Sed me jam mavult dicere Roma suam.—*Martial*.

3. *Bicker*, (Scot. *bicker* or *bykker*), to skirmish, to contend in words; Welsh *bicra*.

4. *Bran*, (Fr. *bran*), the outer coat of grain, separated by grinding; Ir. *bran*, Welsh *bran*, Armor. *brenn*.

5. *Brass*, an alloy of copper and zinc, of a yellow color; Ir. *pras*, Gael. *prais*, Welsh *pres*, Corn. *prest*.

6. *Brogue*, (Scot. *brog* or *brogue*), a coarse shoe worn by the Scotch Highlanders, also a corrupt manner of pronunciation; Ir. *brog*, Gael. *brog*.

7. *Bug*, a bug-bear; Gael. *bocan*, Welsh *bwg* or *brgan*. Hence *bogle* or *boggle*, a bug-bear.

8. *Cabin*, (Fr. *cabane*), a small room; Ir. *caban* or *cabain*, Welsh *caban*, a diminutive from *cab*, a booth.

9. *Clan*, a race, tribe; Ir. *clann*.

10. *Clean*, (Anglo-Saxon, *clæn*), pure; Ir. *glan*, Gael. *glan*, Welsh *glan* or *glain*, Armor. *glan*.

11. *Dad* or *Daddy*, a father; Ir. *taid*, Gael. *daidein*, Welsh *tad*, Corn. *tad* or *taz*, Armor. *tad*.

12. *Glave*, (Fr. *glaive*), a broad sword, a falchion; Welsh *glaif*, a bill-hook, a crooked sword, a scimitar, Armor. *eleze*, a sword.

13. *Kilt*, (Scot. *kilt* or *kelt*), a kind of short petticoat worn by Scotch Highlanders; Gael. *cealt*, apparel, clothes.

14. *Pibroch*, (Scot. *pibroch*), a Highland air; Ir. *ag piobaireachd*, piping; Gael. *piobaireachd*, a pipe tune.

15. *Plaid* or *plad*, (Scot. *plaid*), a striped or variegated cloth, worn by the Scotch Highlanders; Gael. *plaide*, a blanket, a plaid.

16. *Reel*, (Scot. *reel*), a kind of dance; Gael. *righil*.

17. *Trouse* or *Trousers*, (Fr. *trousses*), breeches and stockings in one garment, Ir. *triús* and *triusan*, Gael. *triubhas*, Welsh *trws*, a covering, dress.

18. *Usquebaugh* or *whiskey*, (Scot. *iskie bac*), a distilled spirit; Ir. *uisge beatha*, water of life; Gael. *uisge beathsa*.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

DIOCESAN RECORD.

THIS summary is still necessarily imperfect. The intelligence has most of it been gleaned from the periodicals of the day, for want of more reliable sources of knowledge. If our friends will furnish us with such materials as come to their hands, and which are beyond our reach without their aid, we will make this department a complete and accessible record of all the more important facts touching the condition and history of the American Church. Only those who have had occasion to consult the past, have any true idea of the importance of such a record as is here proposed, and all such, we trust, will contribute their means to make the summary as full and as perfect as can be desired. Journals of Conventions, Reports of Societies, and Catalogues of Ecclesiastical and Literary Institutions, are especially appropriate to our wants.

ORDINATIONS.

PRIESTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Church.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Bannister, J. M.,	Johns, Vir.,	April 24,	St. Paul's,	Petersburg, Vir.
Bolton, C. Winter,	Potter, Pa.,	April 16,	St. Peter's,	N. Y. City.
Cook, Thomas,	Potter, Pa.,	April 16,	St. Peter's,	N. Y. City.
Dennison, H. M.,	Johns, Vir.,	April 24,	St. Paul's,	Petersburg, Vir.
Dooley, Thomas B.,	McIlvaine, Ohio,	March 22,	All Saints',	Portsmouth, Ohio.
Norton, G. H.,	Meade, Vir.,	March 31,	St. Paul's,	Norfolk, Vir.
Tracey, James Call,	Whittingham, Md.,	April 30,	St. George's,	Mount Savage, Md.

DEACONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Church.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Donnelly, J. B.,	Ives, N. C.,	March 5,	Christ,	Raleigh, N. C.
Foot, George C.,	DeLancey, W. N. Y.,	March 19,	St. Peter's,	Auburn, W. N. Y.
Garfield, L. Nathaniel,	Potter, Pa.,	April 16,	St. Peter's,	N. Y. City.
Greene, Lewis,	Eastburn,	March 1,	St. Anne's,	Lowell, Mass.
Littlejohn, Abram N.,	DeLancey, W. N. Y.,	March 19,	St. Peter's,	Auburn, W. N. Y.
Rice, Spencer M.,	DeLancey, W. N. Y.,	March 19,	St. Peter's,	Auburn, W. N. Y.
Sansom, Henry,	Potter, Pa.,	April 16,	St. Peter's,	N. Y. City.
Trapier, Richard S.,	Potter, Pa.,	March 5,	Ascension,	Philadelphia.
Willard, George,	McCoskry, Mich.,	Feb. 20,	St. Paul's,	Jackson, Mich.

CONSECRATIONS OF CHURCHES.

Messiah,	Port Richmond, Pa.,	Potter,	April 24.
St. Thomas,	Glassborough, G. J.,	Doane,	
St. Paul's,	Laporte, Ind.,	Kemper,	April 2.
Holy Apostles,	N. Y. City,	DeLancey,	April 8.
Grace,	Mansfield, Ohio,	McIlvaine,	May 5.

REMOVALS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>From Church, &c.</i>	<i>Place.</i>	<i>To Church, &c.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Allen, Ethan,		Charleston, S. C.,	St. John's,	Baltimore county, Md.
Babbitt, Pierre Teller,		Pittsfield Mass.,	St. Paul's,	Woodbury, Conn.
Ballard, Edward,		Delaware,	St. Michael's,	Marblehead, Mass.
Bayley, Enoch,		Cheshire, Conn.,		E. Newmarket, Del. co., Md.
Beardsley, E. Edwards,	St. Peter's,	New York,	St. Thomas',	New Haven, Conn.
Bradin, James W., A. M.,		Warwick Township,	Burlington College,	New Jersey.
Bull, Levi,	St. Mary's,	Westport, Conn.,	Bangor,	Churchtown, Pa.
Bull, Edward C.,	Christ,		Christ,	Rye, N. Y.
Carpenter, Samuel T.,	Missionary,	New York,	Spring Grove,	Lancaster county, Pa.
Carder, James Dixon,		Plymouth, Mass.,	St. George's,	Millford, Conn.
Clark, Samuel A.,		Westchester, Pa.,	Advent,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Claxton, R. B.,	Chap. Dio. School,	Hobart, Delaware co., N. Y.,	Christ,	Madison, Indiana.
Davis, Sheldon,	St. Peter's,		St. Matthew's,	Clinton, Dutchess co., N. Y.
Donnelly, James B.,			St. James,	Hillsborough, Orange co., N. C.
Downing, J. G.,			Zion,	Muncy, Lycoming county, Pa.
Eastman, George B.,				Aven, Livingston co., W. N. Y.
Gardner, H. V.,	Christ,	Harwinton,	St. Paul's Parish,	Tashua and Trumbull, Conn.
Hanson, F. R.,	Christ,	Alabama,		Calvert county, Md.
Harrison, Joshua L.,		Madison, Indiana,	Grace,	Missionary.
Haskins, David Greene,				Medford, Mass.
Holcomb, O. P.,	St. Luke's,	West Granby, N. Y.,		Cheshire, Conn.
Huntington, Enoch,	St. John's,	New Milford, Conn.,	Princ. Lit. Institution,	New York.
Kerr, John J.,	Advent,	Philadelphia, Pa.,		Mass.
Lowell, Robert S. T.,			Christ,	Newark, N. J.
Macurdy, David H.,			St. Paul's,	Waterloo, Seneca co., W. N. Y.
Marble, N. E.,			St. Paul's,	Concord, N. H.
Miller, Benjamin M.,	Trinity,	Mobile, Ala.,	St. Paul's,	Columbus, Lowndes co., Miss.
Moore, G. G.,			Trinity,	Covington, Ky.
Mulchahey, James,			Trinity,	Pawtucket, R. I.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>From Church, &c.</i>	<i>Place.</i>	<i>To Church, &c.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Nichols, Joseph H.,	Trinity,	Bristol, Conn.,	St. Peter's,	Cheshire, Conn.
Nichols, George W.,	St. James',	Westville, Conn.,		Utica, W. N. Y.
Northrup, Beardsley,	St. Paul's,	Jordan, Onondaga co., N. Y.,		West Granby, &c., N. Y.
Porter, G. S.,			Christ,	Derby, Conn.
Potnam, Charles S.,	St. Paul's,	Woodbury, Conn.,	St. Paul's,	Portsmouth, &c., R. I.
Randolph, T. L.,	Christ,	Derby, Conn.,	Ed. Church Review,	New Haven, Conn.
Richardson, Nathaniel S.,		Hannibal, Missouri,	Christ,	Holly Springs, Miss.
Sill, J. W.,	St. Andrew's, &c.,	Darien, Geo.,	Missionary,	Cass and Floyd counties, Ga.
Smith, Thompson L.,			St. John's Institute,	Mt. Alban, Md.
Stewart, James W.,			St. John's,	Concord, Delaware co., Penn.
Traynell, W. H.,	St. George's,	Peterboro',	St. Peter's,	Friendship, W. N. Y.
Weber, William M.,		Milford, Conn.,		Washington, N. C.
White, Ferdinand E.,				Plymouth, Conn.
Wilcoxson, Timothy,			St. Andrew's,	Boston, Mass.
Wright, D. G.,	Grace,	Plainfield, N. H.,	St. Mary's,	Warwick Township, Penn.
Woodward, Enos,	St. Mark's,	Honey Brook, Penn.,	St. Mark's,	Honey Brook, Chester co., Pa.
Woodward, James A.,			St. John's,	Brazond, Texas.
Young, J. Freeman,	Missionary,	Jacksonville, Florida,	Christ,	Bethany, Conn.
Zell, Henry,	Trinity,	Wolcottville, Conn.,		

DIOCESAN.

Pennsylvania. The following is the summary of Episcopal acts during the past year, as given in the Bishop's address to the late Annual Convention.

Of the whole number of Parishes in the Diocese, being about one hundred and twenty, I have officiated in about one hundred. I have also held services in the following places, at which there were no Parishes in Union with the Convention, viz: Morgan's Corners, (Delaware co. ;) Waterstreet, (Huntingdon co. ;) Brown's Mills and Lock's Mills, (Mifflin co. ;) Tunckhannock, (Wyoming co. ;) Great Bend, (Susquehanna co. ;) Tioga Village, (Tioga co. ;) Coudersport, (Potter co. ;) Smethport, (McKean co. ;) Warren, (Warren co. ;) Greenville, (Mercer co. ;) Columbia, (Lancaster co. ;) Summit, (Carbon co. ;) and Tuscarora, (Schuylkill co. ;) making in all one hundred and fourteen points at which I have officiated. In some cases these visits were made without the requisite canonical notice, and Confirmations, of course, were not to be expected. During this period I have preached on one hundred and sixty-five different occasions, addressed the candidates whenever Confirmation was administered, catechised and addressed the children in many of the Parishes, baptized thirteen infants, solemnized seven marriages, attended seven funerals, and administered the communion to one sick person in private. I have administered Confirmation on five different occasions in private to persons who were sick, and have held Confirmations in public on seventy-two occasions, embracing in all *six hundred and six* persons.

I have also Ordained eighteen Clergymen, Consecrated four Churches, laid the corner stones of four Churches, officiated at the re-opening of two Churches which have been materially enlarged and improved, admitted eight Candidates for Orders, received from other Dioceses twelve Clergymen, and dismissed fourteen.

Standing Committee.—Clergy. Rev. Messrs. M. H. Henderson, R. C. Moore, H. Finch, J. A. Williams. *Laity.* J. J. Spencer, M. D., J. P. Pennington, R. W. Howell, J. C. Garthwaite.

Deputies to the General Convention.—Clergy. Rev. Messrs. E. D. Barry, D. D., J. D. Ogilby, D. D., C. Dunn, J. L. Watson. *Laity.* Archer Gifford, Charles C. Stratton, Isaac B. Barker, John Potter.

Supplemental Delegates.—Clergy. Rev. Messrs. W. Staunton, J. A. Williams, A. Stubbs, E. W. Peet. *Laity.* R. S. Field, R. W. Howell, Charles King, R. B. Aertsen.

Treasurer.—Rev. R. J. Germain.

South Carolina. The following summary is from the Journal of the Fifty-ninth Annual Convention of South Carolina, held last February. The number of Clergy is (Bishop, 1; Presbyters, 60; Deacons, 4) 65.

Standing Committee. Rev. Dr. Hanckel, Rev. Messrs. Trapier, Gervais, Keith, J. S. Hanckel; and Messrs. Campbell, Ladson, Lesesne, Laurens, Meminger.

Delegates to the General Convention. Rev. Dr. Hanckel, Rev. Messrs. Young, Trapier, and Walker; and Messrs. Tucker, Allston, Huger and Meminger.

Secretary and Treasurer. Rev. C. Wallace.

Assistant Secretary. Rev. P. T. Keith.

Alabama. The following summary is from the Journal of the Seventeenth Annual Convention of the Diocese, held in Christ Church, Mobile, February 24—26. The number of the Clergy is (Bishop 1, Presbyters and Deacons 23) 24. Mr. H. A. Tayloe was re-elected Secretary, and Mr. W. M. Garrow appointed Assistant Secretary. The Convention Sermon was

preached by the Rev. F. B. Lee. The Parochial Reports give the following statistics—Baptisms, 139, (adults 21.) Confirmed, 33; Communicants, 657. Sunday School Teachers, 57; Scholars, 525. Contributions, \$5011 16.

Standing Committee. Rev. Messrs. Knapp, Massy, Linebaugh; and Messrs. Garrow, Alison, and Lesesne.

Delegates to the General Convention. Rev. Messrs. Knapp, Marbury, Lee, Linebaugh; and Messrs. Taylor, Conley, Wilson and Garrow.

DIOCESAN INSTITUTIONS.

Anniversary of the Protestant Episcopal Church Missionary Society for Seamen in the City and Port of New York. The Anniversary of this Society was recently held in the Church of the Ascension. The Bishop of Western New York with a large number of the city clergy were present. Evening prayer was offered by the Rev. Benjamin I. Haight, D. D., Professor in the General Theological Seminary. The Annual Report of the Society was then read by H. Meigs, Jr., Esq., one of the Vice Presidents, after which a Sermon appropriate to the occasion was preached by the Rev. Dr. Vinton, of St. Paul's Church, Boston. The sentences of the offertory were offered by Bishop DeLancey, while the alms of the people, in behalf of the Society, were received. The concluding prayers were offered, and the benediction pronounced by the Bishop. The amount of alms received is \$218.

The Report is very encouraging in regard to the operations of the Society; but it exhibits a deficiency in its Treasury of \$1300. The object of the Society is one which commends itself strongly to the sympathies of Churchmen; and we trust they will not allow its usefulness to be retarded, by permitting the deficiency to remain unpaid.

Thirty-third Annual Report of the Protestant Episcopal Female Tract Society of Baltimore. It is with feelings of gratitude to the author of every good and perfect gift, that the Managers of the Tract Society present to the public a simple statement of their proceedings during the past year. They are grateful for the opportunity which has been afforded them of disseminating those blessed truths of our holy religion, which are as a light to guide the steps of the wayfarer, during his pilgrimage through this mortal life. They are grateful for the increased demand for their publications, which they regard as an intimation of their being adapted to the wants of those for whom they were designed; and for the degree of satisfaction which their subscribers and others have expressed, in regard to the character of their publications during the past year.

Five new tracts have been added to their list.

No. 130. "Old Aunt Rachel on Confirmation."

No. 131. "The Great Assize."

No. 132. "Old Aunt Rachel on Baptism."

No. 133. "The Factory Girl."

No. 134. "A Manual of Devotions."

Numbers 130 and 132, are original tracts in the narrative form, and written in so simple a style as to render them capable of being understood by the most illiterate reader. They may be numbered among the few tracts which seem peculiarly adapted to the wants of our *colored* population. In the short, but touching story of "The Factory Girl," we have proof of the blessed influence of the public ministrations of the Church in reclaiming the erring, and affording consolation to the friendless. No. 134 contains a selection of Prayers designed for the daily use of such persons as have not the means of obtaining a larger work to guide their devotions; and if it should prove the

humble instrument of inducing *one* individual to retire, more frequently, from his usual avocations for the observance of regular and stated seasons of prayer, the compilers will feel that their labors have not been in vain.

South Carolina.—*Society for the Advancement of Christianity in South Carolina.*—The 38th Anniversary—the day before the meeting of the Annual Convention, was commemorated as usual. After “Morning Prayer” at St. Michael’s Church, the Rev. W. Dehon, Rector of St. Stephen’s Parish, and the Church of the Epiphany, and Trinity Church in St. John’s Parish, preached the Sermon from the text “Thy Kingdom come.” The obligation of the Missionary work—the extent of it in South Carolina, and the peculiar, though not exclusive claims of this branch of Missions, were judiciously and earnestly enforced. The members convened at the Library room, heard the report of the Board of Trustees; appointed a committee to report amendments to the Constitution; and elected their officers. Several gentlemen became members of this valuable Society on that occasion.

EDUCATIONAL.

Trinity College.—The Calendar of Trinity College, for 1848, gives the number of Students as follows:

Senior Sophisters,	-	-	-	-	-	-	15
Junior Sophisters,	-	-	-	-	-	-	17
Sophomores,	-	-	-	-	-	-	19
Freshmen,	-	-	-	-	-	-	15
Total,	-	-	-	-	-	-	66

Endowment of Geneva College.—The *Gospel Messenger* says: It is with the greatest pleasure that we record the magnificent grant of the corporation of Trinity Church in the city of New York, to Geneva College, of a permanent annuity of six thousand dollars, to commence in May, 1866, when the Astor lease shall have come in. The immediate effect of this, will be to inspire the Church throughout the Diocese to sustain the College which is now put upon the only basis which can uphold any college in the land—endowment.

For this noble donation the College is indebted to her friends in the city of New York, and also to the influence and judicious exertions of Bishop Delancey and the Rev. Dr. Hale.

Nothing connected with the interests of the Church and literature of Western New York has occurred in our knowledge of more importance.

The College, through God’s blessing, will now be safe from fear of pecuniary difficulty, and we trust that through long years to come, she will ride the waves that we have seen beating against her, and prove to Churchmen and to society at large a fountain of good. All can now aid the College with a sure prospect that their aid will be effectual. For funds, for books, for apparatus, for students, she can now confidently and earnestly appeal to the Church, and to all interested in sound learning, solid piety, and the growth of the Church, with whom the College is connected. We fervently thank the Great Giver of all good for this rich blessing.

Diocesan Theological Seminary—Virginia.—From the catalogue just published, it appears that there are four Professors—Bishop Mead and Drs. Sparrow, May, and Packard—and thirty-four students, viz: in Senior class, twelve; Middle class, eleven; and Junior class, eleven.

William and Mary College—Virginia.—The Visitors of this ancient and venerable Institution recently assembled, when ten members of the Board were present.

The Board continued in session three days, and adjourned late on Saturday night. The result of its labors is, that the President and Professors, one and all of them, resigned their offices, with a view to re-organize the Faculty of the College—these resignations to take effect at the termination of the present course of lectures. The Visitors will meet again on the 11th of July next, when the vacancies created by the resignations above referred to will be filled.

A recent communication in one of the daily papers, says the *Watchman & Observer*, urges the propriety of committing this College entirely to the direction of the Episcopal Church of Virginia. And we do not know, but it is theirs by legitimate inheritance. It is a principle which is beginning to be very generally admitted, that all Institutions of the kind which are not directly under the patronage of the State, are more apt to succeed when they have a distinct denominational character, and when their officers are chosen as well for their religious peculiarities as for their literary attainments. By this means the denomination becomes the patron of the Institution, is responsible for its character, and gives it their support; and there is, moreover, a greater unity in its plans of operation than can be obtained on a more latitudinarian scheme. For some reason or other, this "ancient and venerable Institution" has failed of accomplishing what its founders anticipated or its friends could desire. And probably the reason may be, that the religious element has not been as prominent in its instructions as the community demands, or as the proper government of an Institution imperatively requires. For ourselves we have no doubt that if the Institution were left entirely to the management of the denomination to which it probably of right belongs, we should not be likely to hear again of such painful occurrences as have led to the resignation of the Faculty.

Burlington College and St. Mary's Hall.—New Jersey.—The Semi-annual Examination of these two institutions was most satisfactory. Additional buildings are now erecting, demanded by the increasing number of applicants for admission. Both the College and the Hall were re-opened on the first of May, at which time the corner-stone of the chapel of the College was laid.

Gas at Burlington College.—A complete apparatus for the manufacture of gas, says the *Burlington Gazette*, has just been put in operation at Burlington College, and the extensive buildings of that flourishing institution are now illuminated with the most beautiful of all lights. St. Mary's Hall also, with its still more extensive buildings, together with the residence of Bishop Doane, are also lighted from the same source. The whole experiment has been eminently successful, and has been found to produce a large weekly saving of expense; while the saving of the trouble, dirt and danger, of the former mode of lighting with oil, would of itself be a sufficient gain. The gasometer contains two thousand feet of gas, supplying nearly three hundred burners, which consume the contents of the former three times per week.

St. Timothy's Hall.—Catonsville, near Baltimore, Maryland.—This is a very promising school, on the plan of "a Christian Household." That St. Timothy's Hall will be well conducted and do continued good service to the Church, we have no doubt. The visitatorial care of the Bishop of the Diocese, and the ability of the Faculty, will, under the favor of the Divine Spirit, ren-

der this Institution a noble nursery for the Church, and may many plants rise and grow there, fitted for transplantation into the garden of the Lord, the Church triumphant in the Heavens.

College of St. James.—Maryland.—The steady growth of this prosperous Institution is still continuing. The increase of scholars both demanding and justifying an increased provision for their accommodation, a new building is now in progress, to serve as an additional dormitory, with wash-rooms, &c., underneath. This is not to supersede the contemplated addition to the College of an entire wing, of substantial and permanent structure. The present erection is designed only for temporary use, as now appropriated. It was completed in May, and furnishes ample quarters for the additional students expected.

South Carolina.—School of the Diocese.—The *Charleston Gospel Messenger* says the exercises after the spring vacation, were resumed on the first of May. A copy of the resolutions of the late Convention has been sent to each Clergyman and Vestry; and if, in compliance with the request, a collection be made in behalf of the School in each of our Churches, the Institution will be enabled to undertake the education of beneficiaries, and thus its usefulness be greatly enlarged. It is understood that each individual, or congregation giving a sufficient amount, can *nominate* the youth to be educated. The ability of the Diocese not merely to sustain the School, but to render it all that could be wished, cannot be questioned. That it may languish for a time is feared by some, but that for want of a pious man willing to undertake the self-denying and laborious office of the Teacher, or of parents sufficiently interested in the soul's welfare of their sons, to furnish a sufficient number of pupils,—or for want of patronage from individuals who have the means, and from the congregations, it will have to be relinquished, is an idea not to be entertained for a moment. May all concerned in it (and every member of the Diocese is, or ought to be) have wisdom from above to perceive what they ought to do, and grace to enable them faithfully to fulfill the same.

Trinity School.—New York.—The Spring examination of Trinity School, of which the Rev. William Morris is Rector, was recently had, in the presence of the Rev. Drs. Wainwright and Haight, the Rev. Mr. Jones, and Mr. Cyrus Curtiss, of the Board of Trustees, the Rev. Messrs. Cox, Clapp, and Eigenbrodt, and a large number of the parents and friends of the pupils. The exercises were highly creditable to the Rector and other Teachers, and fully justified the high reputation which this time-honored Institution enjoys. The *Churchman* says, we were much struck with the examination of the elder boys in Odenheimer's Young Churchman Catechised; and were particularly pleased with the specimens of the pupils' writing and drawing, which evinced great attention to these important and attractive departments; and were much superior to what we have been accustomed to see on such occasions. We are happy to know that the school is in a flourishing condition.

Board of Education.—Massachusetts.—We learn with pleasure that the Governor and Council of Massachusetts have appointed J. W. Ingraham, Esq., (well known to Churchman for his long and faithful labors, in years past, in the Sunday School of Boston,) a member of the Board of Education for the ensuing eight years, that being the term of office of the members. This appointment is one of great honor, though of no emolument; and when it is considered that but one member is appointed annually, the distinction will be seen to be the greater from its rarity. Mr. Ingraham's connection with the cause of education, as editor of the School Library and chairman of the Pri-

mary School executive committee, combined with his ample abilities and attainments, entitle him fully to the confidence of the appointing powers.—*Boston Evening Transcript.*

Nashotah.—The following was the condition of this Institution in February last: "The increased number of our household has made great demand upon our house-room. Our accommodations have always been narrow, but never so narrow as now. Since the Ordination of the six in June last, there have been twelve additional divinity students received into the Institution; these as well as the remaining part of our household, have come to us, not from Wisconsin (for only three Americans have become attached to the Institution by reason of a residence in this Territory,) but for the most part have come from the various dioceses—two are from Philadelphia, four from New York, one from Boston, one from Maryland, two from Ohio, one from Mississippi. Two are Swedes, one is a Dane, one a Norwegian, four are English and one Irish; one is a converted Israelite from St. Croix, and there are three Oneida Indians. Some of our young men are of great promise, and I think they will in due time be valuable men for the Church. I have written to the Secretary of Foreign Missions, stating our readiness to receive three or six native Chinese, to educate for the China Mission. Bishop Boone in a late number of "the Spirit of Missions," expressed his strong desire for such education. There are many constraining reasons to make Nashotah peculiarly happy in training such foreigners; our discipline in the general routine of duties, particularly the labor; our plain (but now, at least) *wholesome* diet: our experience with those ignorant of our tongue; (two of the Scandinavians could only say "yes and no" when they came to us; three others were very imperfect in our language, two of the Oneidas knew nothing of English,) and lastly, the *entireness*, so to speak, of the Church with us, would greatly tend to establish the Church in the hearts of these far distant people; I have made the offer in all sincerity, and hope it will be received in like manner. In June next, with divine permission, three more of our brothers will be admitted to Holy Orders; an Englishman, (this young man has been with us over five years,) also an American, four years, and a Dane. In June, also, seven of our young men are expected to be admitted to the Candidatship. You will perhaps have heard that for want of room, we have made use of our Icehouse! forasmuch as this was built in part by special contribution, it is due that I should here state, that the size of the building was such as to allow of our running a brick wall up through the middle, and then dividing the one half part thereof into four rooms, which are occupied by as many students, by day and by night; the other half part is now filled with ice.

"Now, my friend. I must declare to you, that never since the first establishment of this House, has there been so great real contentment as now—there has been uninterrupted good health for almost a year past. It affords me great pleasure to inform you of the establishment of a Parish School, which is under our charge; the school-house is built upon the mission lands, and the school constitutes another "Committee of labor;" it is taught by certain of the brothers, Mr. — the converted Israelite is its superintendent. The school consists of *forty children*, who come to us from the surrounding country. When it is considered that we do not live in a village, also the strict church character of the school, and the usual charge of tuition required, it will be thought by all, a most happy addition to our Mission. The school does more than support itself. It was begun the 1st of December last. This is the first Parish school west of the lakes."

Decrease of Theological Students.—The *N. Y. Evangelist* says, that a gradual decrease for several years past of candidates for the ministry in the Old School Presbyterian Church, is noticed, with some expressions of alarm, by the Presbyterian Treasury. In 1844, there were 364 students in the various stages of education, preparing for the ministry of that Church; in 1846, there were but 339. In the same time there was a diminution of new candidates from 99 to 67. To show this relative deficiency, the Treasury remarks that the Free Church of Scotland, with about seven hundred ministers and eight hundred congregations, has nearly as many Theological students as the Old School Church, which have seventeen hundred ministers and twenty-four hundred congregations. A like decrease is asserted of the graduates of the Congregational and New School Seminaries. In 1843 there were 177 graduates from these institutions, and in 1846 only 150.

Jesuit College—Rochester.—The *American* states that the Mumford Block on South St. Paul street, has been purchased by a German gentleman for \$14,000, for the site of a Jesuit College, and the measures will be taken for the establishment of the Institution in the course of the summer.

OBITUARIES.

In New York city, on Sunday morning, March 5th, in the 74th year of his age, the Rev. THOMAS LYELL, Rector of Christ Church in that city; having filled that office for more than forty-three years.

A cheerful, amiable, and interesting companion; a generous and ostentatious host; a kind neighbor; a faithful friend; a good citizen; a devout Christian; a sound Churchman; a true pastor; a preacher of strong powers of persuading, convincing, edifying, and interesting; a workman in the vineyard of the Lord, ever ready, devoted and diligent, in whatever department of the Lord's work—and much of it devolved upon him during his long ministry—fell, in the due order of the Church, to his lot.

Dr. Lyell was a native of Virginia. His parents were members of the Church, and he accordingly received baptism in the Church, in infancy. His family, however, were among those, who, probably, on account of the then prostrate condition of the Church in that state, connected themselves with the Methodist denomination, in which he became a preacher when quite a young man, not we believe, more than 18 years of age. A part of this ministry was exercised in Providence, Rhode Island—a period during which he enjoyed the kind and friendly regards of the late Bishop Bowen of South Carolina, then Rector of St. John's, Providence. While in the Methodist ministry, and yet a young man, during the latter part of Mr. John Adams', and the beginning of Mr. Jefferson's administration, he was appointed one of the Chaplains to Congress, Bishop Claggett, of Maryland, being the other; a circumstance which was instrumental in bringing him back to the Church.

In 1804, he was Ordained a Deacon by Bishop Claggett, and at the close of that year, on the resignation of the Rev. Dr. Pilmore, who removed to Philadelphia, he became Rector of Christ Church; and was soon Ordained Priest by Bishop Benjamin Moore, and instituted (or, as it was then called, inducted) into his Rectorship.

On the elevation of Dr. Hobart to the Episcopate, in 1811, Dr. Lyell was elected his successor as Secretary of the Convention of this Diocese; which office he held, by annual elections, until he declined it in 1816. In 1813, he was elected a member of the Standing Committee of the Diocese, a post which he continued to hold till his death, with the exception of a short period, when he voluntarily retired, from motives of delicacy, in consequence

of there being certain matters before the Committee, in which he was a party concerned, as Rector of Christ Church. In 1818, he was chosen a deputy to the General Convention, and continued to be ever after, until he declined a re-election in 1844. On the floors of both the General and Diocesan Conventions, he often rivited the attention of his fellow members by earnest, unartificial, and powerful displays of extempore eloquence. Ever since its removal to this city in 1822, he was a Trustee of the General Theological Seminary, and uniformly constant and faithful in the duties of the station. He was connected, too, with almost all the Church Institutions of this Diocese, located in this city; ever setting, when health allowed, the wholesome example of punctuality and fidelity in the trusts thus reposed in him. In 1822, the degree of D. D. was conferred upon him by Columbia College in this city.

In New York city, on Friday, May 26th, the Rev. ALEXANDER FRAZER, in the 46th year of his age.

A native of Scotland, and early in life religiously inclined, Mr. Frazer became a preacher among the Primitive Methodists, in which capacity he officiated in London and other places in England, with much acceptance, for several years. About sixteen years since he came to this country, intending to pass through to Canada, where he purposed to take Holy Orders in the Church, and to serve as a Missionary. His plans, however, were so far changed, that he remained in New York, and was ordained by the Bishop in 1833, and became Missionary, first in what is now the Diocese of Western New York, and afterwards at North Salem, and parts adjacent, from which latter post he was transferred to this city in 1836 as a Missionary of the New York Protestant Episcopal Missionary Society, which office he held, first as Missionary in charge of the Church of the Holy Evangelists, and afterwards as Missionary at large for four years: in both of which capacities he labored with great zeal and diligence.

As illustrative of his deep interest in his pastoral duties, and of his mental powers, it may be mentioned that while Missionary in New York, finding that he was brought in contact with many French and German Emigrants, he made himself at once sufficiently acquainted with these languages to converse and officiate therein.

The remaining years of his life were most usefully passed as the minister of St. Philip's Church, New York, and one of the Chaplains of the Sailor's Snug Harbor, Staten Island. Mr. Frazer was marked by great simplicity of character, earnestness of purpose, warmth of piety, and devotion to the great duties of his high and holy office. As a son, most dutiful and affectionate: as a friend, faithful and kind: as a husband, true and loving: and as a Pastor, instant in season and out of season in the discharge of his sacred functions, as many can testify, who at the last day will prove his crown of rejoicing.

In New York city, in March, Dr. JOHN STEARNS, one of the leading physicians in that city and a member of the Church, who for many years has taken an active part in several of its institutions in that city. He was a man universally respected and beloved. He was a member of most of the Church Institutions, of the Board of Trustees of the General Theological Seminary, the Board of Trustees of the N. Y. Protestant Episcopal Public Schools, etc. etc.

In Lyons, Wayne Co., N. Y., on the 13th of March, Hon. AMBROSE SPENCER, aged 83 years. He was not educated in the Church which had the affections of his heart in the latter years of his life. It has been said, and we

suppose it to be true, that his letter to Chancellor Kent, avowing his conversion to the Episcopal Church, passed a similar letter from the Chancellor by mail, avowing alike conviction.

In New York city, May 10, HON. DAVID S. JONES, in the 71st year of his age.

Mr. Jones was a man of strongly marked character; of noble and generous sympathies, of high sense of honor, vigorous intellect, and inflexible integrity. A son of the Hon. Samuel Jones, the "father of the New York Bar," inheriting many of his father's traits of character, and trained under his eye to the legal profession, he formed in early life those habits of discrimination and research, of accuracy and promptitude in business, which paved the way to his professional eminence. Before the age of twenty-one, he was appointed by Gov. Jay, his Private Secretary, a delicate and responsible office, which Mr. Jay had himself filled in the eventful period of the Revolution. In this situation, Mr. Jones was brought into intercourse with some of the most distinguished men of the day, and laid the foundation of intimacies and friendships which were afterward the pride and solace of his life, and were continued with unabated warmth, until they were interrupted by death.

But, though favored by his early advantages and associations, Mr. Jones did not rely on them to build up for himself a reputation; but, devoting himself to his professional pursuits, with indomitable energy and untiring industry, he fairly earned the sterling reputation which he enjoyed. During the twenty-five years that he was at the bar, he never failed a day to be at his office, except on days which religion has consecrated to higher purposes, or on which he was detained at home by a death in his family. As a natural consequence, he became eminent in that department of law to which his attention was chiefly directed: the soundness of his legal opinions, the dispatch and promptitude, the accuracy and fidelity of his business habits, combined with his lofty integrity, gave him a distinguished position in society, and rendered his profession a source of emolument and honor.

In ecclesiastical affairs, Mr. Jones took an active and conspicuous part. For many years he was a lay delegate from St. Mark's Church, in this city, to the Diocesan Convention. He was a Trustee of the General Theological Seminary, from its final establishment in this city in 1822, and until his removal from the city, a few years since, one of its Standing Committee. At the time of his decease, he was Senior Warden of St. Saviour's Church, Maspeth, having been chosen to that office at the organization of the parish, last year. He was also, for the last twenty years of his life, a faithful and efficient member of the Board of Trustees of Columbia College, of which institution he was an Alumnus. In all these appointments, he was remarkable for his regularity, punctuality, and diligence, in the discharge of the duties which they devolved on him. Those who have been associated with him in the conduct of these institutions, or who have had occasion to confer with him confidentially on their affairs, will bear witness to the penetration and solidity of his judgment, and to the inflexible honesty of purpose which determined him to the pursuit of their true interests, even when they came (as they sometimes did) in collision with his cherished personal predilections, or the solicitation of his friends.

SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Archbishop of Canterbury. The Rt. Rev. Dr. Sumner was confirmed as Archbishop of Canterbury, at Bow Church, on Friday, March 10th. The Commissioners were the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Winchester, Oxford, Rochester, St. Asaph, Peterborough, Chichester, St. David's, Bath and Wells, Ely and Lichfield. The Bishops of Madras and Antigua, were also present.

The ENTHRONIZATION of the Archbishop of Canterbury took place on Friday, April 28th, 1848, such an event not having taken place for the last hundred and thirty years.

Among the dignitaries of the Church present, there were the Bishops of Rochester, Chichester, Norwich, Lincoln, Llandaff, Manchester, Ripon, Worcester, Madras, Antigua, Frederickton, &c.

The Venite was sung to Tallis' chant—the psalms of the day to Gregorian's. Prayers were said by the Rev. Mr. Bennet, M. A., and the Lessons by the Rev. George P. Morriott, M. A. At the end of the first Lesson, the Rev. Archdeacon Croft, attended by Dr. Lyall, the Dean, and Dr. Spry, the Vice-Dean of the Cathedral, left his stall and proceeded to the altar, to his Grace the Archbishop, who, rising at his approach, was conducted by him to the throne, a new erection of most exquisite workmanship, placed in the centre of the choir on the south side, and having placed his Grace in a seat of dignity, Dr. Burnbay, the Vicar-General, presented to the Archdeacon the mandate of enthronization, which was read by the Hon. Daniel Finch, auditor of the Cathedral; after which the Archdeacon read the following form of induction:

"I, James Croft, Master of Arts, Archdeacon of Canterbury, do induct, install, and enthrone you, the most Reverend Father in God, John Bird Sumner, Doctor of Divinity, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, into the Archbishopric and Archiepiscopal Dignity of the See of Canterbury, and into the real, actual, and corporal possessions of the same, with all and singular the rights, dignities, honors, pre-eminences and appurtenances thereof; and the LORD preserve your going out and your coming in, from this time forth for ever more. Amen."

Morning service being ended, the Archdeacon again approached the throne and conducted his Grace, attended by the Dean and Sub-Dean of the province, and the Dean and Sub-Dean of the Cathedral, to the marble-chair, a venerable piece of ecclesiastical antiquity, which was placed in front of the high altar, at the head of the first flight of steps leading to that venerated place. Here his Grace was seated, while the Archdeacon repeated the same form of induction; and soon as it was ended he again rose and proceeded, conducted as before, down the choir to the Dean's stall under the grand screen, where the Archdeacon installed him in the following form:

"I James Croft, Master of Arts, Archdeacon of Canterbury, place you, the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bird Sumner, Doctor in Divinity, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, in this stall or seat, in sign and token of your taking and having real and actual possession of the See of Canterbury, of all the rights and privileges thereof."

The ceremonies attending the enthronization being thus complete, the choristers sang the grand "Te Deum" of Mendelssohn, the sublime effect of which appeared to thrill through the whole of the vast assemblage.

That done, the Archdeacon read the suffrages, the choir chanting the answers.

And after the suffrages, he read the following prayer :

"Almighty God, the giver of all good things, who by thy HOLY SPIRIT hast appointed divers orders of Ministers in Thy Church, mercifully behold Thy servant, John Bird Sumner, who is now admitted to the high office and dignity of Archbishop of this province, and so replenish him with the truth of Thy doctrine, and adorn him with innocency of life, that both by word and deed he may faithfully serve Thee in this office, to the glory of Thy name, and to the edifying and well-governing of Thy Church. Grant, we beseech Thee, that he may long live happily to rule this Church, and that having worthily fulfilled his course, at the latter day he may receive the crown of righteousness laid up by the LORD the Righteous Judge, who liveth and reigneth, one GOD with the FATHER and the HOLY GHOST, world without end. Amen."

His Grace then, from the Dean's stall, in a clear voice, pronounced the benediction, thus finishing the public services of this imposing ceremony, when the people gradually and slowly retired.

Archbishop Sumner was born in 1780 ; consecrated to the See of Chester in 1828 ; and will enter on the Primacy at the advanced age of 68 years. Besides his work entitled "*Apostolical preaching Considered*," he has published several others which are doubtless familiar to very many of our readers,—such as his *Expository Writings* ; *Treatise on the Records of Creation* ; *The Evidences of Christianity* ; and various *Sermons and Charges*.

The Bishop of Chester. Friday having been appointed for the election of Bishop of the Diocese of Chester, rendered vacant by the promotion of Dr. John Bird Sumner to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, the proceedings created no inconsiderable interest, twenty years having elapsed since the occurrence of a similar ceremony. The Hon. and Rev. Dr. Anson, D. D., Dean of Chester, entered the Cathedral shortly before eleven o'clock, being accompanied by the Rev. Dr. Slade, Vicar of Bolton-le-Moors, and the Rev. J. Eaton, Canons Residentiary of the Cathedral, with the officials ; and, the usual ceremonies having been gone through, Dr. John Graham was unanimously elected to the vacant Bishopric of Chester.

He took his degree of B. A., in the year 1816, when he acquired honors seldom equalled, very seldom surpassed, being Fourth Wrangler in a very distinguished year, (the first three Wranglers were Jacob, Whewell, and Higman,) and being placed equal with Mr. Lawson, of Magdalene College, for the Chancellor's Medal ; thus exhibiting equally brilliant attainments in mathematical and classical studies.

Consecration of Dr. Hampden. The Consecration of Dr. Hampden took place on the 4th Sunday in Lent, (March 26th.) at Lambeth Palace. The Bishops officiating were, John Bird Sumner, Primate and Metropolitan ; Edward Coppleston, Bishop of Llandaff ; Edward Stanley, Bishop of Norwich ; and Henry Pepys, Bishop of Worcester. The preacher on the occasion was Dr. Hinds, one of the Domestic Chaplains of the Archbishop of Dublin. His text was Matthew xxviii, 20. "Lo I am with you alway," &c.

Dr. Hampden takes his seat at once in the House of Lords.

Death of Bishop Russell. The Rt. Rev. Michael Russell, D. C. L., LL. D., Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway, expired suddenly at his residence, Summerfield, near Leith, on the evening of the Fourth Sunday in Lent. He preached that day in his Church (St. James', Leith,) with more than usual energy, and thereafter administered the Holy Communion. He also

said Evening Prayer, his Curate preaching. At these services the Bishop appeared in his usual health. After family worship in the evening, he retired, and died suddenly in his room about 11 o'clock. The Scottish Church has thus lost one of her most distinguished Prelates. His zeal in extending the Church was remarkable, and blessed with much success, as under his Episcopate the united Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway has risen to a comparatively large and flourishing district, consisting of twenty congregations, served by twenty-two Clergymen. His great literary attainments are sufficiently evidenced by his numerous and interesting works.

Death of Bishop Kyle. The Rt. Rev. Samuel Kyle, D. D., Lord Bishop of Cork, Ross and Cleynce, died at his residence in Dublin, on Wednesday, 17th of May last.

Proposed New Diocese of St. Alban's. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners intend to recommend to the Government the formation of a new Diocese, to comprise a portion of the extensive See of the Bishop of Rochester, and part of that of the Bishop of Ely. At present, the whole of Essex, Hertfordshire, and a portion of Kent, are comprised in the Diocese of Rochester, while the See of Ely includes the whole of Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire, Bedfordshire, and a part of Suffolk. It is proposed that the new Diocese of St. Alban's and Bedford, including the Deaneries of Berkhamstead, Watford, Barnet, Hertford, Walwyn, St. Alban's, Hitchin, Baldock, Bennington, Buntingford, Bishop's Stortford, Ware, Bedford, Clopham, Dunstable, Fleete, Luton, and Shefford, containing 107 rectories, 112 vicarages, and 36 donative and perpetual curacies, served by about 400 Clergymen. The new See of St. Alban's will thus be larger than either of the Dioceses of St. Asaph, Bangor, Chichester, Llandaff, Carlisle, Durham, or Sodor and Man.

When the arrangement shall have been made, the Diocese of Rochester will consist of the whole of Essex (a few parishes closely bordering on London excepted) and a portion of Kent, containing 255 rectories, 165 vicarages, and 57 perpetual and donative curacies, served by about 700 Clergymen. Under the new arrangement, the Diocese of Ely will consist of the whole of Cambridgeshire, the whole of Huntingdonshire, and part of Suffolk, comprising 232 rectories, 131 vicarages, and 71 donative and perpetual curacies, served by nearly 600 Clergymen.

Chester. On the foundation of the See of Chester (A. D. 1541) there were in the Diocese, exclusive of the portion assigned some years ago to Ripon, 327 Churches; from that time to the year 1828, 186 additional ones were built, averaging two new Churches in every three years. The present Bishop of Chester has Consecrated 233, averaging one new Church each month during his long Episcopate.

We notice, that on Trinity Sunday, being one of the stated times of Ordination, appointments for that purpose were made by the Archbishop of York, and by the Bishops of London, Lincoln, Rochester, Bath and Wells, Gloucester and Bristol, Exeter, Peterborough, Worcester, Chichester, Lichfield, Ely, Oxford, Manchester, and Hereford. All candidates from Cambridge were required to have passed the Voluntary Theological Examination.

The following shows in what an important light the Baptism of an infant Princess is viewed in the English Church. The scene as described, must have been scarcely less beautiful, than when, years since, this same noble Queen, while yet in the morning of her days, meekly knelt at the altar to receive the Rite of Confirmation from the late Primate, and when, among a

crowded assemblage of Royalty and of illustrious persons, every eye was filled with tears.

The ceremony of the Baptism of the infant Princess, fourth daughter of the Queen and Prince Albert, took place on Saturday evening, May 13th, in the private Chapel of Buckingham Palace. The Queen Dowager and the Royal Family, the foreign Princes in England, the Clergy, the foreign and Cabinet Ministers, and the ladies and gentlemen of the Royal Household, assisting in, or invited to the ceremony, arrived at the Palace between six and seven o'clock. The Lord Chamberlain having conducted the Queen to the room in which the Queen Dowager and the other illustrious visitors had assembled, the procession of the sponsors was immediately marshalled by the Garter King of Arms, and passed into the Chapel. Her Majesty was accompanied by the Prince of Wales, Prince Alfred, the Princess Royal, and the Princess Alice. The Lord Chamberlain, accompanied by the Groom of Stole to his Royal Highness, Prince Albert, conducted the infant Princess into the Chapel. Her Royal Highness was carried by the head nurse. The Baptismal service was performed most impressively by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Queen Dowager made the responses, on behalf of the illustrious sponsors, and on his Grace asking the name of the child, her Majesty named the Princess, *Louisa Caroline Alberta*.

CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

The annual report of this Society for 1846—1847, states that its income for the year had been £116,827 18s. 11d., which exceeds that of the former year by £14,369 13s. 6d., and is the largest annual income the Society ever received. This increase, however, was chiefly owing to legacies, which amounted to more than £14,000. The report ends with the following summary of its labors and concluding remarks:—

Stations, - - - - -	100
European Ordained Ministers, - - - - -	114
East-Indian and Country-born Ordained Missionaries, - - -	4
Native Ordained Missionaries, - - - - -	6
European Catechists, School-Masters, and other Laymen, - - -	33
European Female Teachers, - - - - -	8
East-Indian and Country-born Catechists and other Teachers, - - -	19
Native Catechists and other teachers of all classes, - - -	1,096
East-Indian and Country-born School-Mistresses, - - -	3
Native School-Mistresses, - - - - -	152
Communicants, - - - - -	11,970

A review of the events which have occurred in the various Missions of the Society during the past year, presents three important facts to which the Committee would invite special attention.

First. It appears that the ancient false religions which for more than twenty centuries have held the nations of the earth in abject slavery, are now waning in their influence.

Buddhism, which has extended its sway over a larger portion of the family of man than any other superstition, is failing; failing, moreover, even in parts where neither Christianity nor civilization has penetrated. According to the reports of our Missionary, at the Island of Pootoo, the sacred metropolis of Buddhism in China, the number of priests has been diminished by more than 300 during the last century; and the dilapidated state of their temples, and the evident signs of contempt for them among the people, show that Buddhism is destined, ere long, to fall, from mere inherent decay. The King of Siam sent an embassy to Ceylon, the reputed cradle of Buddhism, to seek

elements for re-kindling the flame of devotion in his own dominions; and there he learnt from the representative of the ancient line of Buddhist kings that the cause is failing, and that, even with the help of gold from Siam, it can scarcely survive another century.

That Brahminism is declining before the power of Christian truth, and the progress of European science, is testified by every intelligent observer; by the lamentations of deserted shrines, and by the bitter enmity of enraged devotees.

Secondly. Another great fact which presents itself is, that the Mahomedan and heathen secular powers are beginning to admit the principle of toleration, in the place of bigotry and persecution.

The edict of toleration in China has been sufficiently tested, and proved to be no dead letter, but the admission of a principle which the Celestial Empire has not the power to contravene. The partial recognition of this principle by the Turkish Sultan, the secular head and guardian of Mahomedanism, is a still more astonishing event. And even in Central Africa, as it appears from the missionaries at Abbeokouta, the same principle of toleration is recognised, and presents an open field to the teachers of the Christian faith.

The third fact is, the tendency to decay in the lapsed Christian Churches of the East, and the disposition among their members to seek refuge within the pale of Protestantism. Manifestations of this appear in the "transition state" of the Syrian Christians of Travancore; in the accepted aid of our mission by the Coptic Church; and, upon a still larger scale, in the late defections of Armenian Christians at Constantinople.

It thus appears as though the forces which have long held the minds of men in subjection were withdrawing, and leaving a clear and open field for some approaching contest between other contending parties. There can be little doubt what those other contending parties will be. The troops are mustering. Here and there they survey and cast up the ground for fortifying some strong position. The missionaries from Rome, and the missionaries from the Protestants of Europe and America are the parties taking the field. Each successive year affords fresh proof of the warlike activity in the Romish camp, and sees multitudes sent out on foreign missions, who have been trained in the college of the Propaganda. In numbers and activity they far outdo the advocates of the truth. While we are meditating to send a missionary or catechist to a distant tribe of North-West-American Indians, 1000 miles from the missionary head quarters of both parties, we hear that four Romish priests are already among them! While the Church of England for a whole year seeks, and seeks in vain, for one single missionary to China, the Romish agent at Hong Kong negotiates for a contract with a Steam Navigation Company to carry to China one hundred priests within the year! Their missionary lists contain a host of archbishops, bishops, vicars apostolical, priests, deacons, sub-deacons, and nuns. In extent of ground they surround and overspread our positions. The intrusions into our missions at Krishnaghor and New Zealand are but faint skirmishes, to be numbered among the many signs which unequivocally proclaim that the battle between Popery and Protestantism must be fought on the mission field no less than at home.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

St. Paul's Cathedral, Calcutta.—The following letter from the Lord Bishop of Calcutta was read:—

"Bishop's College, Calcutta, Oct. 30, 1847.

"Rev. and dear Sir,—Allow me to present a few copies of the Final Re-

port of the Cathedral of St. Paul's, Calcutta, for the acceptance of the Venerable Society, whose munificence contributed so materially to its erection and endowment.

"The anxious labors and cares of eight years were amply rewarded on the day of consecration, October 8th, last. Such a sight had never been seen in Calcutta, as on that day. An uninterrupted success had attended the progress of the work. The deviations from the regular Gothic, imposed by the climate, had long been acknowledged to be wise and proper.—Expectation was all awake. The magnificence of the scene, both within and without the sacred edifice, must have been witnessed, in order to be fully credited.

"Our ordinary Sunday congregations are 300 or 400. On this week-day service at least 1100 crowded the choir, the lantern of the tower, and the steps of the four doors of approach.

"As I drove towards the Cathedral, not only the close itself, but all the adjoining fields, were filled with carriages, and burst with its rude magnificence upon my view. The variety of equipages, the heathen coachmen and servants, the sable interspersed crowd of pedestrians, aroused the most earnest feelings and prayer for the conversion of the people to the faith of Christ.

"When I entered the great western door, the whole length of the sacred edifice opened before me—248 feet, including the walls; a sea of heads on all hands; the beautiful picture of the Crucifixion rising above them in the great eastern window; the holy table, with Her Majesty's superb service of Communion plate; the stalls for the Clergy on the south and north sides of the choir; the Governor General's and Bishop's seats; the pews crowded with anxious auditors; all was a magic scene.

"In a moment the organ burst forth, and the procession began. Forty Clergy were present, and twenty Divinity Students.

"When the Petition had been read in the front of the sacred table, the procession proceeded down the choir, repeating the sublime 24th Psalm.

On its return a pause was made, to allow the middle aisle to be filled with benches for the convenience of the attendant crowd.

"When Morning Prayer began, it was delightful to find that the hearing was perfect; nothing could surpass the clear, melodious, gentle echo of the reader's voice. The coolness, also, of the choir was remarked by every one; to which the lofty roof and the double-glazed windows of ground glass contributed.

"When I ascended the pulpit, which itself is a beautiful work of art, I was overpowered with the sight. The vast multitude were singing the 100th Psalm, led by the superb organ, of which the fine and rich and mellow tones charmed every ear. The anxious eyes of the multitude were fixed in devotion. I believe I made myself heard from one end of the choir to the other: it is 131 feet by 61, and 47 high. May God be pleased to bless. The Society will see the discourse prefixed to the Report.

"At the Offertory, nearly 2000 rupees were collected for the Calcutta additional Clergy Society.

"The Holy Communion then commenced. The Clergy all kneeling round the sacred table, all in their surplices, as in Cathedrals at home, was a most touching scene. Between 140 and 150 communicants partook of the blessed Sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord.

"The entire service lasted about five hours. The impression of the whole scene on the native crowds was extraordinary, and scarcely less so on the East India population.

"Daily service has been celebrated since, and two full services on the Lord's Day, with every prospect of steady congregations, about 400 on Sunday mornings, and 30 to 50 on week days, and of an abundant blessing upon them.

"But this blessing must, I am aware, come from above. The external building is nothing: the spiritual end, in the conversion and edification of souls, is what, I hope, I am singly looking to. The great work is now to be entered on. We have not finished,—we have only prepared for our grand object. I trust the pure Gospel of Christ, free from all Romanizing tendencies, will be preached in this new edifice from generation to generation; and that the edifying usages and rites of our Protestant Episcopal Church, as settled by Cranmer, Ridley, Jewel, and Hooker, may be most carefully and strictly observed.

"Then will the Cathedral be a nucleus of grace and truth to heathen India; then will it constitute a guarantee for the naturalization of Christianity in the East; then will it help on the glorious consummation, when all nations shall remember themselves, and be turned to the glorious Saviour, the Son of Righteousness, and the hope of all the ends of the earth.

"With dutiful regard to His Grace the President, and affectionate love to all the brethren, I am, &c.

"D. CALCUTTA.

"To the Secretary of the Venerable Society
for Promoting Christian Knowledge."

SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL IN FOREIGN PARTS.

East Indian Missions. The following extracts are taken from a speech of the Lord Bishop of Madras, delivered at Bath, last February, at a meeting in behalf of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. They will be found extremely valuable, as the authentic testimony of an eyewitness to the spiritual condition of Tinnevely, Ceylon, and India generally:—

"Tinnevely is, we have reason to hope, the seed-plot of the Gospel in Southern India. Through the labors of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel there, and of the Church Missionary Society, for they are one in purpose, one in object, one in labor, and God forbid that here, or any where, I should be supposed to be desirous of dissociating one from the other, either in its labors, or in the respect and reputation which those labors claim,—by the faithful labors, I say, of the missionaries of those Societies, Christianity has struck its roots deep in Tinnevely. It has already begun to bear much fruit, and that fruit will, I doubt not, in God's good time, increase a hundred fold."

"We have at this time upwards of forty thousand Christians who are under complete Christian discipline, and who are faithful followers, so far as this can be predicated of any human being, of the doctrines of Jesus Christ. I hesitate not to assure you, from personal knowledge, that the converts to Christianity in Tinnevely are really converts to Jesus Christ. Do not believe those—for, alas! there are such—who attempt to deny, or at least to question, the truth of the reports of the conversions to Christianity in that country. Alas! alas! there are some of our countrymen even now in India, who dishonor the name of Christian which they bear, and then they turn into contempt and ridicule the labors of our missionaries. But those of them who love Christ in sincerity and in truth, those who know the value of the immortal soul, and who are really well acquainted with the state and prospects of our missionary labors in that country, will tell you a very different tale. The world has struggled against its introduction there, and as a country we have done nothing to offer Christianity to the natives of India; and were it not for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and the Church Missionary Society, that land would still be brooded over with darkness and superstition from the Himalaya to Cape Comorin."

"But God has blessed his faithful servants in their labors there. The first time I visited Tinnevely was about seven years ago. I found there twenty-three thousand native Christians. I visited it three years subsequently, and I found about 45,000 native Christians there. Thus in three years the Christian population had almost doubled. You may say that the annals of the Roman Catholic Church can be brought forward in support of a similar statement. I acknowledge it. There are in India many hundred thousand persons who call themselves Christians, and profess the Roman Catholic religion; but that religion is most decidedly not the religion which you or I would wish to see progressing among the people. I hesitate not to express my fears—for I am bound to speak the truth—that the Roman Catholic natives have only exchanged one species of idolatry for another. I was, not long ago, at the extreme point of India, Cape Comorin, where there is a population of perhaps 40,000 native Roman Catholics. I inquired, through my missionary chaplain, into the knowledge of the people. I found they were well acquainted with St. Anthony, and that they knew very well St. Francis, meaning, I suppose, Francis Xavier, who nobly won to himself the name of the Apostle of India, yet not one whom they should take as their mediator with God. They all knew the Virgin Mary, some few had heard of Jesus, but scarcely one appeared to know JESUS CHRIST as the only Saviour. Now compare this (and I do not speak of it invidiously, but as a fact) with the Christian knowledge and the Christian faith, the Christian love and the Christian humility, and the Christian endurance under the severest trials, which is manifested by the Protestant Christians in Tinnevely."

"Allusions have been made on several occasions to the Diocese of Colombo, and to the Christian work which the Dutch carried on there, in contrast with England. Now I was Bishop of Ceylon for seven years, and I am bound to say, I can not altogether subscribe to the correctness of what has been stated this morning, though resting upon printed reports. I do not think the Dutch did much for Christianity in Ceylon. They did something for the forms and ceremonies, and outward show of religion, but very little for vital Christianity. When I went to Ceylon, I found that, under the auspices, and by the direct command of the Dutch Government, the Sacrament of Baptism had been sold in the streets at the rate of three halfpence a head. The Dutch thought that it would add to their respectability to introduce Christianity, and they passed a resolution that no one should be employed in any department of the public service, however low or humble, unless he were a Christian; and to make the people Christians, they instituted the office of Proponents, who went throughout the length and breadth of the land, sounding a drum to call together the people round about them for Baptism.

"Now I need scarcely say, that the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts does not seek to make converts in this way. It sends out to the British Colonies the whole Gospel; it labors to establish by its missionaries the Church in its full integrity; and it is a delightful sight which would cheer your hearts to see in that province of Tinnevely its 21 Churches open every day for divine service; every morning and every evening, to see them thronged with Christian worshipers, and to be assured that they come not out of ostentation, not merely to get a name to live while they are dead, but to feed on the LORD JESUS CHRIST. There is a sincerity in the Christianity introduced into India, under the auspices of this Society, and the Church Missionary Society, which gives an earnest, that the Gospel will sooner or later be known throughout the land."

"More especially I would wish an interest in your prayers on behalf of India. It is a deeply interesting land; a land which God has committed to

us, not that we should extract from it the filthy lucre of gain, but that we should introduce into it the pure Gospel of Jesus CHRIST. In my own Diocese the Society provides for 21 missionaries, and has work for at least two hundred. I speak now of the Diocese of Madras alone, but it has been my lot to visit almost the whole of India. For seven years I was Bishop of Colombo, and for a year and a half acting Bishop of Calcutta. During that time I traversed nearly the whole of that country where the Society's operations are carried on, and, therefore, I am entitled to speak of the Society. We need many more laborers in the LORD's vineyard; and if we had them, there is good reason to hope for the decided conversion of the people. I say, its decided conversion! Hindooism is shaken to pieces; but there it stops. There is reason to fear that Great Britain may make of the Indian character a people of deists; the Church of England will unquestionably make of them a Church of JESUS CHRIST. It is in this work that I seek to engage your interests."

JERUSALEM, THE BISHOPRIC AND ITS INSTITUTIONS.

THE MISSION IN SYRIA.

Establishment at Jerusalem. The Rt. Rev. S. Gobat, D. D., Bishop.

Principal of the Hebrew College, Rev. W. D. Veitch, M. A.

Missionaries: Revs. J. Nicolayson, F. C. Ewald, and A. J. Behrens.

Lay Assistant, Mr. James B. Cohen.

Clerk of the Works and Superintendent of Schools, Mr. R. R. Critchlow.

Medical Department: E. Macgowan, M. D.; Mr. R. Sandford, Surgeon; Mr. M. P. Bergheim, Chief Assistant, and two other Assistants; Mr. C. S. Rosenthal, Interpreter; one Keeper of the Bible Depository; and one School Master.

Establishment at Jaffa. Dr. Kiel, Missionary and Keeper of the Depository.

At Safet. Mr. J. O. Lord, and Mr. A. Tymmit, Missionaries.

[Of these nineteen individuals, ten are Jewish Christians. The entire expense of the mission, with the exception of £600 per annum, arising out of the King of Prussia's endowment, is defrayed by the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews.]

Beyrout. Rev. H. Winbolt.

Aleppo. Rev. Thomas Kerns, M. D.; Mr. J. W. Singnaki; Mr. D. Laurie.

Bagdad. Rev. M. Vicars.

Bussorah. Rev. H. A. Stern.

The College. Besides the establishment of a school and hospital, the late Bishop Alexander opened a College at Jerusalem, on the 19th of May, 1842, and it was placed under the direction of the Rev. W. D. Veitch, assisted by the Rev. J. Nicolayson, and the Rev. F. C. Ewald, who began by giving daily lessons in divinity, Hebrew, Arabic, and Greek, English, and German. Its object is to receive converts, and prepare them for future usefulness. "The inmates," says Mr. Ewald, "I am happy to state, make great progress. . . . They are very anxious to improve their minds, and, therefore, study very hard. They are always the first at morning and evening prayers, and show, by their lives and conversations, that they are CHRIST'S." Five were in the College in the September following, when the Bishop examined them, and "expressed his satisfaction at the progress they had made."

The Principal reports at the close of 1844: "I have every cause to be grateful for the progress made by the students. . . . Now I can converse with them with ease in the English language, and they reply to me with

fluency, and tolerable correctness and propriety. They write the language easily, and often present me with long passages of original composition, requiring very few emendations." "In the divinity lecture I have had much to commend; they would now pass a very creditable examination, and be able to give a very fair account of the doctrines of the Church of England. I have the assurance from the Bishop that they have made a fair and creditable progress in German; and from Mr. Ewald, who conducted the Hebrew lectures, that he had cause to be fully satisfied."

"The progress made by the students during the past year (1845) has been very satisfactory. The half-yearly examinations have agreeably surprised all present, as regards the acquirements attained by the students during the time they have enjoyed the benefits of the institution. The Rev. J. Nicolayson now assists in the Hebrew and Rabinical lectures." Dr. Abeken, who was present at the examination in September, 1845, remarked to the Principal, that "he could scarcely have believed it possible for any young men, who, all save one, were ignorant of the Greek alphabet in the beginning of January, to have learned so much Greek in so short a time." They also passed a very creditable examination in Prof. Burton's "Sketch of the First Four Centuries."

Of the examination in June last, (1846,) the Rev. W. D. Veitch says: "I am happy to say it was again satisfactory." The students were examined in the Greek Testament, (Rom. iii.) "Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History," Arabic, and Hebrew.

THE CHURCH IN CANADA.

The English Church, in the Province of Canada, is divided, as our readers are aware, into two Dioceses,—Quebec and Toronto,—the one distinguished as Canada East, and the other as Canada West. Of the first, of which Lord Bishop Mountain is the Diocesan, we have no special statistical information: but with regard to the latter, of which the Hon. and Right Rev. Dr. Strachan is the Diocesan, we are enabled to gather from the two publications before us, some highly gratifying intelligence. These publications are, first, *The Fifth Annual Report of the incorporated Society of the Diocese of Toronto, for the year ending on the 31st of March, 1848*,—and, second, *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Toronto, at the Visitation in June, 1847*—By John Lord, Bishop of Toronto. The Diocese of Toronto, is divided into two archdeaconries—York and Kingston—and these are divided into districts—and these again into parishes and stations: a full account of which we find in the details of the Society's Report. But we must pass over these details, for the purpose of allowing room for a more particular notice of the triennial Charge of the Bishop, which is a paper of great value. In the opening of this charge, his Lordship alludes to circumstances, with regard to which, the Church in the United States may feelingly sympathize with the colonial Church. We refer to the want of clergymen, and the consequent spiritual destitution of the large and increasing districts, over which the jurisdiction of the Church extends. He thankfully acknowledges the many blessings enjoyed by the Church during the past three years: but, at the same time, he is constrained to confess that the number of clergy in his Diocese has not increased so rapidly as he had reason to anticipate. By the loss of missionaries, by death, removal, and various casualties, the Church had been put to great inconvenience. And, "in the meantime," he says, "our wants and spiritual destitution are increasing as our new settlements extend; and every advance we make in the waste places, only opens new fields of labor, and excites the still more distant settlers to make urgent applications for holy ordinances and a divinely constituted ministry." To show the present extent of this spiritual destitution, his Lordship states, "We have about three hundred and fifty organized townships, and containing about one hundred square miles, or space sufficient to constitute fifteen or twenty English parishes; and we have only one hundred and eighteen clergymen, including two men past

duty, and three who, having no care of souls, are employed in the higher departments of education, but are always disposed to give such services as are in their power. We have therefore two hundred and thirty-seven townships, or more than two-thirds of the whole Diocese, with no resident clergymen. In none of the districts (twenty in number) have we so many as one for every township." And to this statement he adds, "This Diocese is now supposed to contain upwards of six hundred thousand inhabitants. Of these it is believed that one third at least, or two hundred thousand,—scattered indeed over all the townships, belong to, or are favorable to, the Church; and could we embrace them all in one ministration, we should in as long time have the great majority of the whole population; for when the church is beheld in her simplicity, fullness and beauty, she obtains the preference in every well-constructed mind. But owing to the fewness of our clergy, we are in danger of losing many who might, under other circumstances, have become our sincere friends and supporters." His Lordship, however, anticipates great relief from this destitution, in the contemplated plans, as well in the Mother Country, as in his own Diocese, for educating young men for the Colonial Church. And in this respect, we ardently wish the Church in the United States had as much to encourage her. We find an example, in the munificence and zeal of English churchmen, which it would be well to follow, if we would save our immense and increasing territories of the West, from falling into the hands of the heretical and schismatical sects, which are industriously extending their influence to the remotest borders of our country.

Of the abundant labors of the Bishop, we might form some idea from his simple statement, even without the aid of a map. Within the three preceding years, he had visited every mission in his extensive Diocese, administering Confirmation to *four thousand three hundred and fifty-eight persons*.

His Lordship says, "It is very pleasing to remark, that a very great change has been for some years gradually manifesting itself in regard to the holy ordinance of Confirmation. Our people now almost universally believe and recognize it to be an Apostolic institution, and, to all who receive it, a most beautiful and impressive consummation of their baptism. They are further taught to feel that it is the proper introduction to the holy Communion, and bestows upon them a blessed fellowship with the Church in all ages."

We would gladly follow his Lordship through the gratifying details of the public plans adopted for the extension and endowment of the Church, as well at home as as in the Colony: but we can only allow space for a few acknowledged examples of private munificence and zeal, which we should rejoice to see every where followed.

"On my return, (says the Bishop) from visiting the missions west of Toronto, in September, 1845, I found a letter from the Lord Bishop of Ripon, the perusal which dissipated in a moment the continued fatigue which I had been enduring for several months. His Lordship stated, that 'he had the pleasure to inform me that some munificent individual, entirely unknown to him, had deposited in his hands the sum of five thousand pounds sterling, which the donor wished to be appropriated to the building of a Church in the Diocese of Toronto, to be called The Church of the Holy Trinity: the patronage to be left entirely to the Bishop of the Diocese, as well as the situation.' Sacramental plate, surplices, and all things needful, were at the same time promised, and have since been furnished."

With regard to this most munificent gift, the Bishop goes on to say, that on consulting with several of his clergy and other friends of the Church, they concurred with one voice that the free Church should be built at Toronto, being by far the most populous city in the Diocese, and in a locality most likely to embrace the largest portion of the poor.

"Measures (he adds) were immediately taken to find a site for the Church, eligible for the purpose intended, and to proceed without delay to its erection. In the selection of a proper site we met with some difficulty; several were offered, but they were not in the desired locality, and the price demanded by the proprietors of such as might have been deemed eligible, was so great as would have

trenched on the wished for endowment. From anxiety on this subject, however, we were soon relieved by the Honorable John Macaulay, retired Lieutenant Colonel of the Royal Engineers, who bestowed upon us, gratis, the very spot which we had all believed to be the most appropriate, at an expense to himself of more than five hundred pounds. While we offer our warmest thanks for this generous and seasonable gift, we beg to acknowledge our obligations to several other gentlemen who generously offered us sites, but which were declined, because not convenient for the object in view. But we have not done with our generous benefactor. The whole proceedings are clothed with something so delightfully holy, that to dwell upon them is to elevate and purify our own hearts and affections, and thus to produce similar fruit. In due time the sacramental plate for the Church, and also for private communion with the sick, with table-cloths, napkins, and surplices, &c., all of which are very much admired for their tasteful elegance, reached us in safety. But what created still greater admiration, and still deeper feelings of gratitude, were the magnificent gifts, and their beautiful appropriation, for rejoicing on the day of the Consecration of the Church, with which these things were accompanied. First,—the donor desires that fifty pounds sterling be presented at the Offertory on the day of the Consecration of the Church of the Holy Trinity, should the Holy Communion be then administered; if not, on the first occasion on which there is a Communion. Second,—That the same sum be offered to supply gifts and rejoicings for the poor on the day of Consecration. Third,—That the sum of fifty pounds sterling be offered and appropriated for an Altar Cloth for the Church of the Holy Trinity. Fourth,—That the like sum of fifty pounds sterling be offered for the beautifying of the Font; or should that be completed, for any internal decoration for the more devotional observance of Divine Service. Such a complete act of charity, and so thoughtful and delicate in all its arrangements, and descending with holy foresight to the most minute things which might in any way tend to the devotional objects of the gift, is scarcely to be found in the history of the Christian Church. Wealth is indeed a blessing, when it is thus devoted to so noble a purpose as the exterior of Christ's Kingdom.

"But while we are most grateful to the donor who has thus provided for the spiritual instruction of our poor, it may not be out of place to mention some exertions among our own people which have a kindred spirit, and may, by the blessing of God, provoke others to the like good works. The congregation of the township of Danwich is composed of a few families, which are entirely rural in their manners and habits, and manifest the strongest attachment to the Church; of their zeal in her favor they have given many proofs. Though few in number, they have erected a neat Church on a plat of ten acres of land, without any assistance from other quarters. One individual, a farmer, gave eighty pounds towards its erection, another sixty pounds; while the land, and also a set of excellent books for the desk, were the donation of an aged lady of the congregation, now departed, who has left for the benefit of the Church, a small legacy yet to come. They have lately built a commodious Parsonage House, and have added to their Church a handsome steeple, furnished with a large bell; and all this has been done quietly and without any bustle or apparent effort, as if they were matters of course. Is it not from this example evident that there needs only the same spirit to do the same in every populous neighborhood throughout the Diocese?

"The Church in the township of Westminster we owe to the vigorous and unwearied labors of Miss Watson, a lady who came to Canada principally with the view of establishing her nephews on land. On arriving in this township, where a purchase had been made on her behalf, she found it unprovided with religious ordinances. Her first step was to appropriate ten acres of her farm for the site of a Church, Church-yard, and Parsonage; she then appealed to her friends in England for assistance in aid of her own and her neighbor's efforts, and she has now the satisfaction of beholding her exertions crowned with success, in a very commodious Church with a respectable Congregation. A few such persons in each District, and their waste places would soon rejoice and blossom.

"In the township of Malahide we have a signal proof of what may be done by

a single person, whose heart is in the work. Mr. Johnson has a large family, and is not a wealthy farmer, nevertheless he resolved upon building a Church on his own farm. The Church is almost completed, as he is determined to finish it without any assistance. This he says he had on his mind when he first came into the woods and settled on his land, and was an invigorating source of encouragement which never left him; and to this he attributes his continual health and gradual progress towards independence. It was, he remarked, a great undertaking for a poor man, but he and his family have done most of the work with their own hands; and he thinks he is in better circumstances than he would have been had he made no such attempt. This shows how much a good man may do, even in situations by no means promising, when sincerely disposed and heartily laboring for the honor and service of God. A very few such men could establish and endow a Parish and not feel it a burthen, but a blessing, as Mr. Johnson now does."

But we must reluctantly bring these extracts to a close. We can only add his Lordship's most forcible conclusion of a remarkably just and discriminating view of the two great religious parties, by which the Church, as well in the Canadian Provinces, as in England and the United States, is constantly assailed, and against whose hostility she is forever compelled to stand on her defense.

"While at peace among ourselves, and sincerely devoted to the Church, we possess a bond of union that will make us invincible in our spiritual warfare with our enemies, whether from without or from within. Holding this bond, we shall proceed in harmony and love as brethren, with the same mind and singleness of heart. It will lead us to a conscientious discharge of our duty to God and his Church, by rightly dividing the word to our people, in obedience to her pure and authorized teaching; and in doing this with one heart and one soul, shall feel no sympathy with Romanism on the one hand, which suffocates the truth under a mass of falsehood and corruption, or with Dissent on the other, which not only takes from the truth, but which, in active bitterness against us, we have ever found the more implacable enemy of the two.

"Is it not, then, our duty to rise above difficulties, and exert ourselves to the utmost in promoting the advancement of the Church of God in this Diocese; that Church which is not human in her Constitution, but heavenly, and neither takes her rise from earthly powers, nor depends upon them for her continuance. Empires and Kingdoms fail; the earth itself shall pass away; but the Church of the Living God shall continue forever. Her name—her offices—her services—her laws—her powers—her spiritual endowments—are for eternity. How awful the responsibility which attaches to us, her ministers? The worship we offer is the commencement of the worship of eternity, and our ministrations the beginning of services which are to continue for evermore."

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.—OXFORD.

An address signed by nearly all the Tutors and Lecturers at Oxford, has been presented to the Hebdomadal Board in favor of some extensive alterations in the present system of University Examinations. The following is an outline of the proposed plan.

I. THE FIRST EXAMINATION (or Responsions.)

1. To be passed at some period before the 5th term, and to be held twice in the year,—i. e., in the Michaelmas and Easter Terms.

2. The subjects of the Examination to remain the same as at present with the following additions:

(a) One Gospel in Greek.

(b) The Examination to extend generally to the subjects of the books.

II. THE SECOND EXAMINATION.

1. To be held in the Michaelmas and Easter Terms, and to be passed at any period between the 8th and 12th Terms, with the distinction, as at present, between those who are, and those who are not candidates for honors, as at present, into four classes.

2. The subjects of the Examination.

A. *Minimum.* For an ordinary degree.

1. Text and criticism of the Gospels, Acts, and one of the longer, or two of the shorter, Pauline Epistles; with knowledge of the XXXIX Articles.

2. Two Greek authors, } or vice versa; one of the three being a history.

3. One Latin author, }

4. Latin prose composition, as at present.

5. Logic or Euclid, as at present.

B. *For Honors.*

1. Text and criticism of the Gospels, Acts, and two of the longer, or four of the shorter, Pauline Epistles; with knowledge of the XXXIX Articles.

2. Three Greek authors. } Of whom one at least in each language shall

3. Three Latin authors. } be an historian.

4. The Ethics of Aristotle.

5. Philological and critical papers, as at Cambridge.

6. Latin and Greek composition, as at present.

Mathematical honors, as at present.

III. THE THIRD EXAMINATION.

1. To be passed after the completion of the 12th Term by every candidate for the degree of B. A., in one at least of three schools,—viz. (1.) Theology; (2.) Philosophy, History, and Philology; (3.) Mathematics and Physical Science. The Examination to be held once a year, in the Lent Term, with a bye-Examination in the Act Term, for the convenience of those who are not candidates for honors, to be held by one Examiner in each Board, nominated by his colleagues.

I. *Theology.* A. *Minimum.* For an ordinary Degree.

1. Some portion of the Old Testament in Hebrew. (To be determined by the Examiners.)

2. Text and criticism of the New Testament in Greek.

3. Passages to re-translate into the Greek of the New Testament, and difficult passages in the Original to be explained.

4. History of the Old and New Testament.

5. The History of the English Reformation, with knowledge of the XXXIX Articles.

B. *For Honors.*

1. Two out of three parts of the Old Testament, with specified portions in Hebrew, and the rest in the LXX.

2. Text and criticism of the New Testament in Greek.

3. Passages to re-translate into Hebrew, and difficult passages in the Old and New Testaments to be explained.

4. History of the Old and New Testament.

5. History of the three first centuries, (including, at the discretion of the candidate, the study of some writer of that period.)

II. *Philosophy, History, and Philology.* A. *Minimum.* For an ordinary Degree.

1. One Philosophical or Historical Book in Greek or Latin (not included in the previous Examination.)

2. Blackstone's Commentaries or Macculloch's Elements or some Elementary treatise in Law or Political Economy.

3. Some given portion of History, (as in Greek History, till the death of Alexander; in Roman, till the end of the second Punic War; in English, till 1688.)

4. Some one book in a foreign language, with exercises and translations.

B. *For Honors.* [The three divisions of Philosophy, History, and Phi-

logy, which for an ordinary Degree might be united, as in the above scheme, could for Honors be best separated; whether they should be formed into three distinct schools, is perhaps a matter of comparative indifference; but it should at any rate be understood that it could not be necessary for the student to pass an examination in more than one of them, in order to obtain Honors in this school.

I. *Philosophy*. 1. One Treatise on Logic, Ancient or Modern.

2. One Treatise of Aristotle and of Plato, or instead of them, the fragments of the Philosophers who preceded Socrates.

3. One out of three portions of the History of Philosophy, viz: (1.) Till the Christian Era; (2.) Till the Reformation; (3.) Till the present time.

4. Some standard work, in French or German, bearing upon the subjects of the examination.

II. *History*. 1. Some given portion of History (as above, but to be studied with original documents.)

2. Two ancient Historians.

3. One Standard Work on History in a foreign language. } or vice versa.

4. Adam Smith, Ricardo, or some other treatise on Political Economy, or in lieu of this, Blackstone's Commentaries or some standard work on Law.

III. *Philology*. 1. The History of Greek or of Latin Literature.

2. A treatise ancient and modern on Logic, or a modern treatise on comparative Philology, or on the Philosophy of language.

3. A portion of (a) Greek Literature, as *e. g.*, the *Poetæ Scenici*, or the Epic Poets, and Pindar, or the Orators.

of (b) Latin Literature, as *e. g.*, the Latin Poets to the end of the Augustan age, or from the Augustan age to A. D. 200, or the portion of the Roman Historians, containing the period of the twelve Cæsars, or the works of Cicero.

In all cases any other equivalent to be admitted by the Examiners.

4. A knowledge of German.

5. Composition in Greek and Latin; Critical papers.

III. MATHEMATICAL AND PHYSICAL SCHOOLS.

(A.) *For a Common Degree*. Six books of Euclid; Algebra.

Three subjects in Physical Science not treated mathematically, such as Experimental Mechanics; Experimental Optics; Anatomy; Physiology; Geology, &c., &c.

(B.) *For Honors*. Mathematics; Astronomy; Mechanics; Optics; Thermology; Electrology, &c., &c.

Extending to all Physical Sciences treated mathematically, as at Cambridge.

CAMBRIDGE.

PROPOSED ADDITIONS TO THE COURSE OF STUDY IN THIS UNIVERSITY.

Efforts are now making to embrace in the course of study in this University, certain other branches of science and learning to meet the present wants of the age.

The Syndicate appointed to consider whether it is expedient to afford greater encouragement to the pursuit of those studies for the cultivation of which Professorships have been founded in the University, and if so, by what means that object may be best accomplished, beg leave to make the following report:—

The Syndicate, admitting the superiority of the study of Mathematics and Classics over all others as the basis of general education, and acknowledging therefore the wisdom of adhering to our present system in its main features, are nevertheless of opinion that much good would result from affording

greater encouragement to the pursuit of various other branches of science and learning which are daily acquiring more importance and a higher estimation in the world, and for the teaching of which the University already possesses the necessary means.

In accordance with this view the Syndicate recommend as follows :—

A.

That, at the beginning of each academical year, the Vice-Chancellor shall issue a programme of the subjects, places, and times of the several Professors' Lectures for the year then to ensue.

That all students, who, being candidates for the degree of B.A., or for the honorary degree of M.A., are not candidates for honors, shall, in addition to what is now required of them, have attended before they be admitted to examination for their respective degrees, the lectures delivered during one term at least, by one or more of the following Professors :—

Regius Professor of Laws, Regius Professor of Physic, Professor of Moral Philosophy, Professor of Chemistry, Professor of Anatomy, Professor of Modern History, Professor of Botany, Woodwardian Professor of Geology, Jacksonian Professor of Natural and Experimental Philosophy, Downing Professor of Laws of England, Downing Professor of Medicine, Professor of Mineralogy, Professor of Political Economy : and shall have obtained a certificate of having passed an Examination satisfactory to one of the Professors whose lectures they have chosen to attend.

That all students, who, being candidates for the degree of B.C.L., do not pass the examinations for the first class in that faculty, shall, in addition to what is now required of them, have attended, before they be allowed to keep their act, the lectures delivered during one term at least, by one or more of the following Professors :—

Regius Professor of Physic, Professor of Moral Philosophy, Professor of Chemistry, Professor of Anatomy, Professor of Modern History, Professor of Botany, Woodwardian Professor of Geology, Jacksonian Professor of Natural and Experimental Philosophy, Downing Professor of Medicine, Professor of Mineralogy, Professor of Political Economy ; and shall have obtained a certificate of having passed an Examination satisfactory to one of the Professors whose lectures they have chosen to attend.

That this regulation shall apply to all students answering the above descriptions who shall commence their academical residence in or after the Michaelmas term of the year 1849.

B.

That a New Honor Tripos be established, to be called the *Moral Sciences Tripos*, the places in which shall be determined by an examination in the following subjects :—

Moral Philosophy, Political Economy, Modern History, General Jurisprudence, the Laws of England.

That the Examiners for the *Moral Sciences Tripos* be the Regius Professor of Laws, the Professor of Moral Philosophy, the Professor of Modern History, the Downing Professor of the Laws of England, the Professor of Political Economy, together with one additional Examiner, to be nominated by the Vice-Chancellor and appointed by Grace of the Senate : and in case any of the above-mentioned Professors be prevented from examining in any year, deputies to examine instead of them shall be nominated by the Vice-Chancellor and appointed by Grace of the Senate.

That the examination for the *Moral Sciences Tripos* shall commence on the second Monday after the general admission *ad respondendum questioni*, and shall continue four days.

That all students who shall have passed the examinations, and kept the exercises required for the degree of Bachelor of Civil Law, or of Bachelor of Physic, or who shall have passed the examinations entitling to admission *ad respondendum questioni*, may be candidates for honors in the *Moral Sciences Tripos* next succeeding such examinations.

That the candidates for honors in the *Moral Sciences Tripos* whom the Examiners shall deem worthy of an honor shall be arranged by them in three classes, the places being determined by estimating the merits of each candidate in all the subjects of the examination. And that in these classes marks of distinction shall be affixed to the names of such of the candidates as have shown eminent proficiency in particular subjects.

That the first examination for the *Moral Sciences Tripos*, under the regulations now proposed, shall take place in the year 1851.

C.

That a New Honor Tripos be established, to be called *Natural Sciences Tripos*, the places in which shall be determined by an examination in the following subjects:—

Anatomy, Comparative Anatomy, Physiology, Chemistry, Botany, Geology.

That the Examiners for the *Natural Sciences Tripos* be the Regius Professor of Physic, the Professor of Chemistry, the Professor of Anatomy, the Professor of Botany, the Woodwardian Professor of Geology, together with one additional Examiner, to be nominated by the Vice-Chancellor and appointed by Grace of the Senate; and in case any of the above-mentioned Professors be prevented from examining in any year, deputies to examine instead of them shall be nominated by the Vice-Chancellor and appointed by Grace of the Senate.

That the examination for the *Natural Sciences Tripos* shall commence on the sixth Monday after the general admission *ad respondendum questioni*, and shall continue four days.

That all students who shall have passed the examinations, and kept the exercises required for the degree of Bachelor of Civil Law, or Bachelor of Physic, or who shall have passed the examinations entitling to admission *ad respondendum questioni*, may be candidates for honors in the *Natural Sciences Tripos* next succeeding such examinations.

That the candidates for honors in the *Natural Sciences Tripos* whom the Examiners shall deem worthy of an honor shall be arranged by them in three classes, the places being determined by estimating the aggregate merits of each candidate in all the subjects of the examination; and that in these classes marks of distinction shall be affixed to the names of such of the candidates as have shown eminent proficiency in particular subjects.

That the first examination for the *Natural Sciences Tripos*, under the regulations now proposed, shall take place in the year 1851.

D.

That, with a view to encourage attendance at the lectures of the Mathematical Professors, and to secure a correspondence between those Lectures and the Mathematical Examinations of the University; and also as a means of communicating to the students themselves, from a body of experienced Examiners and Lecturers, correct views of the nature and objects of our Mathematical Examinations: the Lucasian Professor of Mathematics, the Plumian Professor of Astronomy, the Lowndean Professor of Geometry and Astronomy, and the Jacksonian Professor of Natural and Experimental Philosophy, together with the Moderators and Examiners for Mathematical Honors for the time being, as well as those of the two years immediately preceding, be constituted a *Board of Mathematical Studies*, whose duty it shall be

to consult together from time to time on all matters relating to the actual state of Mathematical Studies and Examinations in the University; and to prepare annually and lay before the Vice-Chancellor a report, to be by him published to the University in the Lent or Easter term of each year.

The Syndicate, having respect to the great importance of the study of Theology, and with the view of giving increased efficiency to the regulations already established for the promotion of it, further recommend:—

E.

That all persons who present themselves for examination at the *Theological Examination*, established by Grace of the Senate, May 11, 1842, be required to produce a certificate of having attended the lectures delivered during one term, at least, by two of the three Theological Professors, viz., the Regius Professor of Divinity, the Margaret Professor of Divinity, and the Norrison Professor of Divinity.

That the regulation now proposed shall first come into operation at the Theological Examination in the Michaelmas term of the year 1850.

Robert Phelps, *Vice-Chancellor*. John Graham, W. Whewell, H. Philpott, Alfred Ollivant, Henry S. Maine, John Haviland, James Challis, Henry G. Hand, W. Hopkins, J. J. Smith, C. Merivale, J. Mills, W. H. Thompson, Edward Water.

The Vice-Chancellor gives notice, that separate Graces for adopting the regulations proposed in the parts, A, B, C, D, E, respectively, of the above report, will be offered to the Senate early in the Michaelmas term of the present year.

PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE.

The Jewish Disabilities Bill, introduced into the House of Commons by Lord John Russell, is as follows:—"That it is expedient to remove all civil disabilities at present existing affecting her Majesty's subjects of the Jewish Religion, with the like exceptions as are provided for her Majesty's subjects professing the Roman Catholic Religion." This Bill having been carried through the House of Commons by majorities from 61 to 67, has at last met with a signal defeat in the House of Lords, by a majority of 35, where it has been refused a second reading. The following Bishops voted against it:—The Archbishops of Canterbury, and Armagh, the Bishops of Bangor, Bath and Wells, Carlisle, Chichester, Exeter, Gloucester and Bristol, Lichfield, Lincoln, Llandaff, London, Oxford, Ripon, Rochester, Salisbury, and Winchester.

The following Bishops voted for it:—The Archbishop of York, Bishop Thirlwall of St. Davids, Bishop Pepys of Worcester, Bishop Lee of Manchester, and Bishop Hampden of Hereford. The Bishop of Oxford, and Lord Stanley distinguished themselves by able speeches against this attempt to unchristianize the British Parliament, and to place the English Church under the control, not only of Romanists, Unitarians, and Infidels, but of Jews also, who look upon Christianity as a false and blasphemous faith. Well did Bishop Wilberforce say, "between the Christian and the Jew there is a gulf as wide as eternity itself."

New Test of Heresy. It has been proposed to introduce into the "Clergy Offences Bill," now passing through Parliament, a proviso, making the XXXIX Articles the standard of Heresy. The Bishop of Exeter has addressed an earnest letter to the Clergy of his Diocese, apprising them of this design, and calling their attention to it, in order that they may, if they think fit, present their judgment on it to the Bishops and to Parliament. His Lordship regards with alarm, the proposal to exclude the teachings of the Catechism and the declarations of the Liturgy from the test of Heresy.

EDITORIAL.

WE take this opportunity gratefully to acknowledge to our brethren of the press, the expression of their kind opinion of the first Number of the Review ; and also to our patrons, their generous support of our undertaking. The circulation of the Review, equals our most sanguine anticipations, extending to every Diocese in the United States, except one, and also to England and her North American Colonies, and is sufficient to render its permanent establishment scarcely a matter of doubt. It is worthy of consideration by those who favor us with their contributions, that their messages of truth will eventually visit the remotest sections of the Church militant.

Although we have hitherto been sparing of our promises, and, even now speak with caution, yet we venture to say, that a corps of contributors has been secured for the Review, which we believe will make it, what has continually been the object of our ambition, the ablest Quarterly Magazine in the country. As a record of Ecclesiastical and University Intelligence, it will be found worthy of confidence.

They who have supposed that any design in establishing the Church Review, was to wage a religious controversy, and especially with the sectarian press, have mistaken our object. Although in contending for the Truth of God, we have no compromises to make, and in rebuking the reckless radicalism of the age, in all its forms, we have nothing to keep back ; yet we shall never stoop to petty bickering with any party, sect, or school, whatsoever.

☞ We need not call attention to the Review of "Kenrick on the Primacy," in the present Number. The series of articles, of which this is the first, will, we are confident, be found the most complete demonstration of the sophistry and weakness, the unscripturalness and anti-Catholicity, of the Papal claims, which has recently appeared. They will be valuable for future reference.

¶ Our readers will be pleased to learn, that the portraits of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York are to be continued. They will at once detect the hand of a Master in these Sketches.

¶ THE JESUITS. We have in our possession (through the kindness of the "Historiographer of the Early Church") authentic and rare documents pertaining to the origin, history, and character of the "Society of Jesus," so called, which we shall arrange for the Review, as soon as the pressure of other engagements will permit. Their recent expulsion from Rome, and the number of them who are finding refuge in our own country, render reliable information respecting them desirable.

¶ The Review of "Bishop Chase's Reminiscences," is necessarily deferred.

¶ Several Books, just received, will receive attention in due time.

¶ All Articles for publication should be sent to us at least three months previous to the issuing of the number, in which they are designed to appear.

¶ It is due to the Rev. Francis Vinton, to say, that he is not responsible for the grammatical inaccuracy noticed in our last Number, by the Reviewer of "Updike's History of the Church in Narragansett."

¶ We beg leave to call attention to the terms of the Review on the third page of the cover.